

REV. J. ORMISTON,
2-KENSINGTON PLACE,
CLIFTON.

THE
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

Vol. XIII.

THE
L I F E
OF
ARCHBISHOP LAUD.

BY
CHARLES WEBB LE BAS, M.A.

PROFESSOR IN THE EAST INDIA COLLEGE, HERTS, AND LATE
FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

Lately published,

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

I.

The LIFE of WICLIF.

6s.

II.

The LIFE of ARCHBISHOP CRANMER.

In Two Vols. 12s.

III.

The LIFE of BISHOP JEWEL.

6s.

*The above are printed uniformly with the present Works
and illustrated with Portraits.*





FIG. 2

WILLIAM BENTLEY, D.D.

1686-1752

283.092
L3632

THE

LIFE

OF

ARCHBISHOP LAUD.

BY

CHARLES WEBB LE BAS, M.A.

PROFESSOR IN THE EAST INDIA COLLEGE, HERTS, AND LATE
FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

~~115948~~

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD,
AND WATERLOO PLACE, PALL MALL.

1836.

LIBRARY ST. MARY'S COLLEGE

L O N D O N :
GILBERT & RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

1573—1617.

PAGE

Birth and Parentage of Laud—His early education—His character at Oxford—State of the University—Laud suspected of Popish opinions—Incurs blame for the marriage of the Earl of Devonshire—Is attacked by Dr. Airay, as a favourer of Popery—Hall's Letter to him—is introduced to Dr. Neile—Is elected President of St. John's College, Oxford—Dr. Robert Abbot preaches against him, before the University—Laud is made Dean of Gloucester—Restores order in the Cathedral—Royal Injunctions of 1616-17.	1
--	---

CHAPTER II.

1617—1625.

King James's Journey to Scotland—Articles of Perth—Laud is made a Prebendary of Westminster—Is promoted to the Bishopric of St. David's—He resigns the Presidentship of St. John's—Misadventure of Archbishop Abbot—Laud takes his seat in the House of Peers—Censure of Knight's Sermon—Royal Injunctions of 1622—Laud's Conference with the Jesuit Fisher—His intimacy with Buckingham—Beginning of his misunderstanding with Bishop Williams—Supply voted by the Convocation—Laud bitterly censured by Abbot for endeavouring to procure some indulgence for the inferior Clergy, in the period of payment—He saves the Charterhouse from Confiscation—Death of King James.	34
---	----

CHAPTER III.

1625—1627.

Charles's first Parliament—Censure of Montague's Book by the Commons—Williams declines, and Laud rises, in the royal favour—Laud assists at the Coronation—He is	
--	--

charged with placing a crucifix on the Altar, and of altering the Coronation Oath—These charges examined—He preaches at the opening of the second Parliament—Committee of Religion—Further proceedings against Montague—Proclamation of 1626 against novelties in doctrine and discipline—Second Parliament dissolved—Dr. Goodman, Bishop of Gloucester, suspected of Popery—Laud exposed to blame for aiding Buckingham in his defence against his impeachment—Also, for drawing up Speeches for the King—Laud is translated to the See of Bath and Wells—Draws up the royal instructions for a supply—His conduct and principles considered—He is made Dean of the Chapel Royal—Sermons of Sibthorpe and Manwaring—Sequestration of Archbishop Abbot. 75

CHAPTER IV.

1628—1630.

Charles's third Parliament—Petition of Right—Proceedings against Manwaring—Remonstrance of the Commons—Laud in danger—He draws up an answer to the Remonstrance—He is translated to the See of London—Assassination of Buckingham—Laud's conduct at the examination of Felton—Laud reforms the disorders in the election of Proctors, at Oxford—His zeal for the advancement of Literature—Reprint of the 39 Articles, with the Royal Declaration prefixed—Exasperation of the Puritans—The Vow, or Protestation, of the Commons—Laud draws up an Answer—The wisdom and moderation of his Views—The third Parliament dissolved—Laud is threatened by the Puritanical faction—Royal Injunctions of 1629—Laud's apprehensions for the Church and State—He is made Chancellor of the University of Oxford—Punishment of Leighton for publishing "Zion's plea against the Prelates"—Laud had no concern in the Sentence—He consecrates St. Catherine Cree, and other Churches, and is charged with using Superstitious Ceremonies—This charge considered. 110

CHAPTER V.

1631—1634.

The purchase of Improvements by the Puritans—The Scheme overthrown by Laud—Repair of St. Paul's—Laud's benefactions to the University of Oxford—Theological disputes there—Laud unjustly charged with usurping patronage—He procures the appointment of well-

affected men, to Dignities in the Church—The King's Printers fined for negligence—Sherfield censured for breaking a painted window—The King's visit to Scotland, and his Coronation there—Laud is elevated to the Primacy—His policy, as contrasted with that of his predecessor, Abbot—A Cardinal's Hat is offered to Laud—His refusal of it—He is elected Chancellor of Dublin—He revives the practice of requiring a *title* from Candidates for Holy Orders—This *reform* is resented as an *innovation*—Book of Sports—Conduct of Laud respecting it—Clamour of the Puritans against him—Laud's Metropolitanical Visitation—His power disputed by Bishop Williams—Williams's Jurisdiction suspended—Controversy respecting the Altar..... 148

CHAPTER VI.

1634—1637.

Laud endeavours to bring the foreign Protestant Churches to conformity with the Church of England—He labours to improve the condition of the London Clergy—He obtains from the Crown the restitution of Irish Improvements—The Church of Ireland is brought to conformity with the Church of England—Laud is made a Commissioner of the Treasury—He resigns the office, and procures the appointment for Juxon—He proceeds with his Metropolitanical Visitation—Enforces the repair of Cathedrals, and other reforms—He is unjustly suspected of countenancing the Popish designs of the Queen—He establishes his right to visit the Universities—He obtains for Oxford a new body of Statutes, and the Caroline Charter—He is accused of aiming at the office of *Universal Lawgiver*—His charity and munificence—They cry against him as a persecutor—He entertains the King and Queen at Oxford—Punishment of Prynne, Bastwicke, and Burton—Laud's vindication of himself from the charge of bringing back Popery, &c.—He is assailed with virulent libels—Prosecution of Bishop Williams..... 189

CHAPTER VII.

1637—1640.

Failure of the attempt to introduce the English Liturgy into Scotland—Laud continues to prosecute his ecclesiastical labours—He denounces the intrigues of the Papists be-

fore the Council—He reprints his Conference with Fisher ; but is, nevertheless, assailed as an inveterate Papist—Chillingworth reclaimed from Popery by Laud—Laud's intercourse with Hales, for whom he procures a Canonry at Windsor—Laud enforces the censorship of the press—Is assailed for abusing this power—His answer to the charge—His continued munificence—He engages Hall to compose his Treatise on Episcopacy—The corrections suggested by him—He procures the suppression of Bagshaw's *readings* on Stat. 23. Edw. III. c. 7.—He is assailed as an incendiary—He addresses a letter to the Helvetic Churches, protesting his desire for peace—Joins Strafford and Hamilton in recommending a Parliament—Precipitate dissolution of Parliament—The Convocation continues to sit, by order of the King, and with the sanction of the Crown Lawyers—The Canons, and *et cetera* oath—The public fury directed against Laud—The dreams and presentiments of the Archbishop, on his approaching fall—The prognostics and falsehoods circulated by his enemies—Rome's Masterpiece. 232

CHAPTER VIII.

1640—1645.

A Committee of the Long Parliament appointed to prepare charges against Laud—Scottish Articles against him—Impeachment of Laud—His commitment to the Black Rod—Articles of Impeachment—Laud's address to the Lords—His commitment to the Tower—His sufferings during his imprisonment—Additional Articles—His trial and defence—His recapitulation before the Lords—His defence before the Commons—He is condemned by an Ordinance of the two Houses—His behaviour at the scaffold—His execution. 277

CHAPTER IX.

General view of the character and principles of Laud 330

APPENDIX 390

LIFE

OF

ARCHBISHOP LAUD.

CHAPTER I.

A. D. 1573—1617.

Birth and Parentage of Laud—His early education—His character at Oxford—State of the University—Laud suspected of Popish opinions—Incurs blame for the marriage of the Earl of Devonshire—Is attacked by Dr. Airay, as a favourer of Popery—Hall's Letter to him—Is introduced to Dr. Neile—Is elected President of St. John's College, Oxford—Dr. Robert Abbot preaches against him, before the University—Laud is made Dean of Gloucester—Restores order in the Cathedral—Royal Injunctions of 1616-17.

THE birth-place of William Laud, was Reading, the principal town of Berkshire. His A. D. 1573. father, William Laud, was, by occupation, a clothier, of good repute, and of no inconsiderable prosperity; for his business was sufficiently extensive to enable him to keep many looms at work on his own premises, and to retain a number of weavers and other artizans in constant employment. The maiden-name of his mother was Lucy Webb, a sister of Sir William Webb, who was Lord Mayor of London, in the

year 1591. Her first husband was John Robinson, also a clothier, of the same town; a man of no ordinary wealth and credit. Her children by this marriage were two daughters and one son: both the daughters were most respectably married; the son entered the Church, and became a Prebendary of Westminster, and Archdeacon of Nottingham. After the death of John Robinson, his widow became the wife of William Laud. Of this second marriage, the celebrated subject of this narrative was the only child. The day of his birth was the 7th of October, 1573¹.

The foregoing statement is valuable chiefly as it may serve to expose the ill-nature of his enemies; who, in the intensity of their zeal for his disparagement, wearied themselves with endeavours to depress the man, by representing his parentage as contemptibly mean, and sordid²: apparently unconscious that, by lowering his origin, they were but exalting the abilities which procured his elevation. It is somewhat remarkable that, on one occasion, subsequently to his advancement to the primacy, Laud himself had, for a moment, the weakness to be disturbed by these despicable imputations. His biographer, Dr. Heylyn, found him one day in his garden, at Lambeth, with signs of unusual commotion on his countenance. When questioned respecting the cause of his agitation, the Archbishop produced a printed libel, "which had been stopped at the press, in which he found himself reproached with so base a parentage, as if he had been raked out of a dung-

¹ Heylyn's *Life of Laud*, p. 46. ed. 1668. Wood, *Ath.* vol. iii. col. 117. ed. Bliss.

² Prynne's *Breviat*.

hill; adding withal, that, though he had not the good fortune to be born a gentleman, yet, he thanked God, he had been born of honest parents, who lived in plentiful condition, employed many poor people in their way, and left a good report behind them." The reply of Heylyn was admirable for its vivacity and good sense. He reminded the primate, that "Pope Sextus V., as stout a pope as ever wore the triple crown, but a poor man's son, did use familiarly to say, in contempt of such libels as were frequently made against him, that he was born of an *illustrious* house, (*domo natus illustri,*) because the sun-beams passing through the broken walls and ragged roof, *illustrated* every corner of the homely cottage in which he was born." The aptness and felicity of the instance produced their effect. The countenance of the Archbishop cleared up; and he thought no more of the stupid slanderers of his pedigree¹.

The childhood of Laud was miserably weak and sickly. We learn from the very first sentence in his own diary, that in his infancy, he was in danger of death. He recovered sufficient health, however, to attend the Free School, at Reading. Of his boyhood little is known, except, that it was passed under the discipline of a severe school-master, and that it afforded distinct promise of future eminence. The sagacity of the pedagogue, we learn, was equal to his austerity. He was so struck with his pupil's nimbleness of apprehension, with his vivacity of remark, with his high spirit, and (even at that early age) with the strange complexion of his dreams, as confidently to anticipate that he was destined for no

¹ Heylyn, p. 47, 48.

ordinary career. And this persuasion he was accustomed to express, by saying, "When you are a little great man, remember Reading School¹." During the whole period of his youth, indeed, the stripling was noted for untiring industry, methodical habits of study, surprising faithfulness of memory, singular activity of fancy, and almost premature solidity of judgment. So bright were the anticipations of all to whom he was known, that considerable sums of money were offered for his maintenance, upon no other security than the early indications of his powers². In July, 1589, he was entered as a commoner at St. John's College, where he fully maintained the reputation which he brought with him from Reading. He had the good fortune to be placed under the care of one who had the penetration to estimate duly the abilities of his pupil, and the generosity to foster and encourage them. His tutor was Dr. Buckeridge, then a Fellow of the Society, afterwards its President, and, subsequently, Bishop of Rochester. After residing one year as a
June, 1590. Commoner, on his own resources, Laud was chosen a Scholar of St. John's, on the nomination of the Mayor and Corporation of Reading. This promotion might be considered in a certain measure, as a tribute of respect for the worth of his father. But it was, likewise, beyond all question, an honourable testimony to the character which he had already established in the University, as a laborious and successful student. At the end of three years from this time, he was admitted to a fellow-

¹ Lloyd's Memoirs, &c. Laud, p. 255. ed. 1668.

² Lloyd's State Worthies, p. 991, &c. ed. 1670.

ship, according to the custom of the College ; and in June, 1594, proceeded to the ^{June, 1593.} degree of Bachelor of Arts. In 1596, and 1597, he suffered severely from indisposition. In 1598, he was made Master of Arts, and was appointed reader in Grammar for that year ; at the end of which, he was again visited with sickness. In January, 1600, he received Deacon's orders from Dr. Young, Bishop of Rochester ; and was ordained Priest by the hand of the same Prelate, in April, 1601. By this time he had become an orphan ; having lost his father in April, 1594, and his mother in November, 1600¹.

In these his youthful days, " he was esteemed by all who knew him, a very forward, confident, and zealous person²." And these indications of a masculine energy were possibly the more conspicuous, as contrasted with the smallness of his stature. It must be remembered, however, that the condition of the University was, at that period, such as naturally to call forth the activity and watchfulness of a thoughtful and studious young man, endowed with more than ordinary strength of character, and maturity of learning. When Laud commenced his academic residence, Oxford bore a greater resemblance, in many respects, to a colony from Geneva, than to a seminary of Anglo-Catholic Divinity. The genius of Calvin presided in the Schools. The dark theory of predestination was maintained as an essential ingredient in the faith of a Christian man. The Apostolic succession of Bishops was treated as little better than a fable. The authority of the Church was scornfully

¹ Diary, p. 1, 2.

² Such, at least, is the description of him recorded by Wood, vol. iii. col. 121.

disregarded. The very existence of a visible Church, during the long period of Papal predominance, was gravely questioned by some distinguished divines, while others maintained that it was to be sought for only in the scattered Conventicles of Berengarians, or among the Albigenses, or the mountaineers of Piedmont, or perhaps, among the Wiclifites of England, or the Hussites of Bohemia. In short, the whole life and virtue of religion appeared to be well nigh concentrated into one thing,—an abrupt and impetuous departure from the Church of Rome.

Now the theological studies of Laud had taught him a very different lesson. They had been prosecuted in the spirit of the Canon of 1671; which enjoined that the interpretation of Scripture should be regulated, not by a licentious exercise of private judgment, but by a strict regard to the doctrines which had been collected from Scripture, by the primitive fathers of the Church. It was remarked by Dr. Young, by whom Laud had been ordained, that his studies had not been confined to the narrow and partial systems of Geneva; but that his scheme of divinity had been raised “upon the noble foundations of the Fathers, the Councils, and the Ecclesiastical Historians.” And, hence, he pronounced that, if the young man’s life should be spared, he would become a fit instrument for the Church’s deliverance from the trammels of every modern school, and for her restoration to the more free and comprehensive principles of the first and purest ages¹. The whole plan and elevation of doctrine which this course of inquiry had set before him, he found to be in strict

¹ Lloyd’s Memoirs, &c. p. 225, 226.

conformity with the original scheme of the Anglican Reformation; but, in many essential respects, at mortal variance with the theory and the practice which then had got possession of the schools. And he was seized with a vehement desire to bring the Church of England from this state of defection, back to her native principles.

It was not long before an opportunity was afforded for the manifestation of his ^{1602.} *zeal*, his *forwardness*, and his *confidence*, in the cause of pure and primitive Christianity. Such was the estimation in which he was held, as a scholar and a divine, that, in 1602, he was admitted to read the Lecture of Mrs. May's foundation, with the full consent and approbation of his College¹. And it was either in this, or some other academical exercise performed about the same time, that he resolved to stand forward in vindication of the Articles and Constitution of the Church. The adventure was one which, in times like those, demanded an intrepid resolution. But Laud had, doubtless, counted the cost of his warfare: and he, accordingly, maintained, in opposition to the predominant theology of the day, "the constant and perpetual visibility of the Church of Christ, derived from the Apostles to the Church of Rome, and continued in that Church, as in others of the East and South, until the Reformation²." By this exploit he marked himself out as an object of

¹ His own words are: "Anno 1602, I read a divinity Lecture in St. John's College. It was then maintained by Mrs. May. I was the last who read it." Diary, p. 2.

² This is Heylyn's statement of the doctrine affirmed by Laud (p. 53). I am not aware that the discourse is extant.

hatred to the Puritans¹, and, more especially to their patron and champion, Dr. George Abbot, Master of University College, Dean of Winchester²; and, in 1603, Vice Chancellor of the University. This divine (who was afterwards elevated to the Primacy of all England) was the foremost man among those who affirmed that it was impossible to discern the visibility of the Church, otherwise than by tracing it, through a straggling series of sects, from the days of Berengarius³ to those of Luther and of Calvin. These opinions he did not embody in writing till the year 1624⁴; but they were notoriously entertained, and urgently contended for by him, at the time when the contrary position was taken up by Laud. There is too much reason to believe that Abbot never forgave this act of open resistance to the authority of his name⁵. And it is most certain that, from that moment to the end of his days, Laud was detested and pursued by the party of Abbot, as a confederate of Popery, and a sworn enemy to the Gospel of Christ.

¹ The *name* of Puritan, it must be kept in mind, is here used historically, and not as a title of reproach. The actions and principles of the party which bore that title, must, of course, be estimated according to their own merits or demerits.

² Wood, vol. ii. col. 561.

³ Berengarius, or Berenger, was an eminent ecclesiastic, who, about the middle of the eleventh century, opposed the sacramental doctrine, subsequently known by the name of Transubstantiation. For an account of him, see Mosh. cent. xi. pt. ii. sect. xiii. &c.

⁴ There is a "Treatise of perpetual visibility and succession of the True Church in all Ages," London, 1624, which is without a name, but is generally ascribed to Abbot. Wood, vol. ii. col. 562.

⁵ Heylyn, p. 53, 54. Rushw. vol. i. p. 434, 440.

In 1603, Laud was selected by his College as a candidate for the office of Proctor, and was chosen by the University on the 4th of May in that year¹. He is said to have executed the duties of that post with a fidelity and activity which gave universal satisfaction². In September, the same year, he was appointed Chaplain to the Earl of Devonshire³. In July, 1604, he became Bachelor of Divinity. From the propositions which he undertook to defend, in his exercises for that degree, it is evident that his spirit was wholly undaunted by the resentment which his first theological essay had so recently called forth. He maintained, first, the necessity of Baptism; and, secondly, that there could be no true Church without Diocesan Bishops. Two subjects more distasteful to the Puritans could not easily have been selected. They did not suffer the occasion to pass without reminding Laud that their eye was constantly upon him. His arguments for the necessity of Baptism were treated with contempt, on the ground that they were borrowed from the writings of Bellarmine; as if all reasoning *must* inevitably be vicious, which had been resorted to by a Papist. For his vindication of Episcopacy, he was severely assailed by Dr. Holland, Rector of Exeter College, who had succeeded Laurence Humphrey in the divinity chair. The mantle of his predecessor, as well as his office, appears to have fallen upon Holland; for he now complained loudly that the disputant was casting the torch of discord between the Church of England and

¹ Lloyd's State Worthies.

² Heylyn, p. 53. Diary, p. 2.

³ Diary, p. 2.

the Reformed Churches beyond the seas¹. The result was a general conviction that Laud was becoming, every day, more thoroughly steeped in Romish superstition.

1605. The year 1605 was distinguished by an event almost fatal to his peace of mind, and highly injurious to his promotion. At this time, he had been three years Chaplain to Charles Lord Mountjoy, the Earl of Devonshire, a nobleman high in the favour of James I., on account of his brilliant services in Ireland. By the urgent and repeated entreaties of this gentleman, Laud was prevailed on to solemnize a marriage between the earl and the Lady Penelope Devereux, daughter of Walter, Earl of Essex, under circumstances which brought down a load of obloquy on all the parties concerned. The lady, it appears, had been divorced from her husband, Lord Rich, in consequence of a criminal intercourse with the Earl of Devonshire. The earl was desirous of repairing, by marriage, the injury inflicted by him on her reputation; and of giving legitimacy to the children which had sprung from their guilty intercourse. It further appears that the parties had conceived an ardent attachment for each other, while the Earl was yet but a younger brother; and that a verbal, but unattested, contract of marriage had passed between them, previously to her union with Lord Rich, (a man of ungracious manners, and of austere,

¹ Heylyn, p. 54. Laurence Humphrey was the biographer of Bishop Jewel. He had drank deeply into the spirit of the Helvetic School. Doctor Holland, who succeeded him in 1589, had served in the Netherlands, as chaplain to the Earl of Leicester, the notorious patron of the Puritanical faction. Wood, vol. ii. col. 111, 112.

unsociable temper,) which alliance had been forced upon her by her parents. It should be recollected that the legal principles applicable to such a case, were, at that time, more unsettled than they are at present: and Laud, overcome by the solicitations of his patron, consented to adopt the more indulgent construction of the law, and to unite the divorced lady in matrimony with the man to whom she had been originally engaged. The result of the transaction was bitterly disastrous to all the parties concerned. The countenance of the king was darkened towards the earl; and the effect of this alienation was fatal to him. He sickened and died under the humiliation, in the course of a twelvemonth; leaving the partner of his frailty to a sorrowful and unhonoured widowhood. His Chaplain, Laud, was overwhelmed with shame and remorse. His unfortunate compliance exposed him, for a long time, to the displeasure of the king, to the upbraidings of his enemies, and to the reproaches of his own conscience. He ever after converted the festival of St. Stephen (on which day he had performed the unhappy solemnity,) into an annual fast, in penitential remembrance of his error; and composed a prayer for the pardon of his offence, which remains to this time, as a monument of his sincere contrition¹.

¹ The affair is thus briefly recorded in his Diary: "Anno 1605. My cross about the Earl of Devon's marriage. Dec. 26, *die Jovis*." The 26th of December is St. Stephen's day.

The following is the prayer composed by him on the occasion: "Behold thy servant, O my God, and in the bowels of thy mercy have compassion on me. Behold, I am become a reproach to thy holy name, by serving my ambition, and the sins of others; which, though I did it by the persuasion of other men, yet my

1606. In the year 1606 Laud was again exposed to the assault of his vigilant adversaries. On the 21st of October, in that year, he delivered a sermon at St. Mary's, which was seized upon as an additional proof of his Romish propensities. The Vice Chancellor in that year was Dr. Henry Airay, the Provost of Queen's College; a man of austere habits, recluse life, and high Calvinistic opinions. Among his publications, was a "Treatise on Bowing at the Name of Jesus¹;" a practice in which he conceived there was as much Idolatry as in worshipping the Brazen Serpent².

own conscience did check and upbraid me in it. Lord, I beseech thee, for the mercies of Jesus Christ, enter not into judgment with me, thy servant, but hear his blood, imploring mercies for me. Neither let this marriage prove a divorcing of my soul from thy grace and favour. For much more happy had I been, if, being mindful of this day, I had suffered martyrdom, as did St. Stephen, the first of martyrs, denying that which either my less faithful friends, or less godly friends, had pressed upon me. I promised myself that the darkness would hide me. But that hope soon vanished away. Nor doth the light appear more plainly, than I, that have committed that foul offence. Even so, O Lord, it pleased thee, of thine infinite mercy, to deject me with this heavy ignominy, that I might learn to seek thy name. O Lord, how grievous is the remembrance of my sins to this very day, after so many and such re-iterated prayers, poured out unto thee, from a sorrowful and afflicted spirit. Be merciful unto me. Hearken to the prayers of thy humble and dejected servant; and raise me up again, O Lord, that I may not die in my sin, but that I may live with thee hereafter; and, living, evermore rejoice in thee, through the merits and the mercies of Jesus Christ, my Lord and Saviour. Amen."—"A brave example," exclaims Heylyn, "of a penitent and afflicted soul; which many of us may admire, but few will imitate." See Heylyn, p. 56, 59.

¹ Wood, vol. ii. col. 177, 178.

² Heylyn, p. 54.

The discourse of Laud had the effect of arraying Dr. Airay among the number of his professed adversaries ; with what justice it is impossible for us to judge, as the composition has not been preserved. Thus much however is known, that, in some way or other, Laud was questioned by the Vice Chancellor¹; but defended himself with such success, that the storm, after growling for some time over his head, rolled away, and left him untouched by any public censure. Nevertheless, his old persecutor, Dr. Abbot, fixed upon this occasion, and openly pointed at him, as one deeply tainted with the Romish leprosy ; till, at last, it was thought dangerous to approach the *heretic*, or to salute him in the streets²! Such was the scandal raised by this discourse, that the report of his unfaithfulness was spread from Oxford to Cambridge ; and that Hall, who was afterwards the exemplary and venerable Bishop of Norwich, was generally believed to have addressed the following expostulation to the preacher :

“ I would I knew where to find you, then I could tell how to take direct aims. Whereas, now I must pore and conjecture. To-day you are in the tents of the Romanists, to-morrow in ours, the next day between both, against both. Our adversaries think you ours, we theirs. Your conscience finds you with both, and neither. I flatter you not. This of yours is the worst of all tempers. Heat and cold have

¹ This affair is thus briefly noticed by Laud in his Diary : “ The quarrel Dr. Airay picked with me about my sermon at St. Mary’s, Oct. 21, 1606.”

² Heylyn, p. 54.

their uses. Lukewarmness is good for nothing, but to trouble the stomach. Those that are spiritually hot, find acceptance. Those that are stark cold, have lesser reckoning. The mean between both is so much worse, as it comes nearer to good, and attains it not. How long will you be in this indifferency? Resolve one way; and know, at last, what you do hold, what you should. Cast off either your wings or your teeth; and, casting off this bat-like nature, be either a bird or a beast. To die wavering or uncertain, yourself will grant fearful. If you must settle, when begin you? If you must begin, why not now? It is dangerous deferring that, whose want is deadly, and whose opportunity is doubtful. God crieth, with Jehu, *who is on my side, who?* Look, at last, out of your window to him, and, in a resolute courage, cast down the Jezebel that hath bewitched you. Is there any impediment, which delay will abate? Is there any which a just answer cannot remove? If you would rather waver, who can settle you? But, if you love not inconstancy, tell us why you stagger? Be plain, or else you never will be firm¹."

Such (if we are not misinformed) was, in those

¹ The above is an extract from a letter of Hall, (Decad. iii. Epist. 5,) addressed to Mr. W. L., "expostulating the cause of his unsettledness in religion, &c. &c." Like the rest of Hall's letters, it is without a date. And though the initials (W. L.) are those of Laud, it is not absolutely certain that he was the person addressed; neither is it positively known that the letter was ever sent. It is stated, however, by Heylyn, p. 54, that, in the general opinion, Laud was the person aimed at. And I am not aware that this surmise has ever been questioned.

days, the language of Hall respecting Laud! of Hall, who lived to take up arms in defence of the Church, under the auspices of the very man whom he now felt himself impelled to rebuke and discipline; of Hall, who was doomed to suffer the bitterest persecution from that same party, which he now was honouring by his countenance and support.

Laud was now in the 34th year of his age. His residence, up to this time, had been constantly at the University. In 1607 he received his first Ecclesiastical preferment, the Vicarage of Stamford, in Northamptonshire, into which he was inducted on the 13th of November. In the following April, the living of North Kilworth, in Leicestershire, was given him. In the same year, (1608), he proceeded, without opposition, to his degree of Doctor of Divinity¹; a step, which, of itself, amounted to something like a public refutation of the calumnies which had branded him as a Papist. In the first place, he had enemies enough at Oxford, ready to contest his advancement to that degree, if, by any substantial proof, they could have fixed upon him the charge of Romanism: and, besides, it is scarcely credible that the University (pervaded as it then was by a spirit of outrageous hostility against the Papists), would lightly have conferred this honour upon one who was a convicted adversary to the Protestant faith. Neither could the degree have been accepted by him if his heart was secretly alienated from the Church of England, "without a most perfidious dissimulation before God and man²:" seeing that no one can take it,

¹ Diary, p. 2.

² Heylyn, p. 55.

without subscribing an abjuration of Popery, as full and distinct as can well be expressed in words ¹.

In the midst of the suspicion and evil will which, even then, were thickly gathering around him, Laud had the consolation to find that one man at least was true and faithful to him, and was prepared to do ample justice to his sincerity. In spite of the unworthy surmises in circulation against him, his honoured friend, and former tutor, Dr. Buckeridge, scrupled not to recommend him to the kind offices of Dr. Neile, Bishop of Rochester, as a person entirely deserving of his confidence and patronage. He was, accordingly, appointed Chaplain to that Prelate, in August, 1608. On the 17th of Sep-

1609. before King James, at Theobalds. On the 28th of October, in the same year, he exchanged his living of North Kilworth for that of West Tilbury, in Essex; in order that his residence might be nearer to that of his patron and protector.

1610. On the 25th of May, he was collated by Bishop Neile to the living of Cuckstone, in Kent; in consequence of which, he resigned his Fellowship at St. John's College, on the 2nd of October, and left the University on the 8th of the same month. At his new benefice he was speedily seized with what he calls a Kentish ague, which continued for two months. In the following November he exchanged Cuckstone for Norton, a benefice of less value, but with a better situation, and a more healthy air ².

¹ Namely, the three Articles of the thirty-sixth Canon of 1603.

² Diary, p. 2, 3. Heylyn, p. 60.

Of the life and habits of Laud, as a parochial clergyman, scarcely any notice has been preserved, except, that one of his first acts, after taking possession of a living, was to assign an annual pension to twelve poor persons ; that he laid aside one fifth part of his income for charitable and pious uses ; and that it was his invariable practice to put the glebe-house into a state of substantial repair, and to see the Church supplied with becoming furniture¹. About this time it was that Dr. Neile was promoted from the See of Rochester to that of Lichfield ; on which occasion, he resigned the Deanery of Westminster, which he had held *in commendam*. Previously to his resignation of it, he represented the merit of Laud so warmly to the king, as to obtain for him the reversion of a stall at Westminster. Neile was succeeded in the Diocese of Rochester by Dr. Buckeridge, then President of St. John's College. On his advancement to the bench, Buckeridge resigned the presidentship ; and, at the same time, encouraged Laud to become a candidate for that office. The post was one
1610.
for which he was eminently adapted. He had, hitherto, as a comparatively obscure individual, stood undaunted before the gathering hostility of the Calvinistic party. A commanding official position might enable him to offer a still more formidable resistance to the spirit of disorder and confusion with which the University had been long possessed. As might be expected, the eye of Dr. George Abbot was keenly fixed upon the movements, which tended towards the establishment of Laud in the headship of St. John's. Abbot had, some time before, removed to London, and

¹ Lloyd's Memoirs, p. 228.

there he had the amplest facilities for labouring, with good promise of success, to defeat an appointment, which, of all others, he most cordially deprecated. He did not suffer the opportunity to slip through his hands. Being, at this period, Archbishop of Canterbury elect, he addressed himself at once to Thomas, Lord Ellesmere, who had formerly been Lord Chancellor of England, and who had recently been elected Chancellor of the University of Oxford. He urgently represented that Laud was, at the least, a Papist in heart; that he associated with none but those who were either Roman Catholics professed, or under the strongest suspicion of a secret attachment to Popery; and that, if he were elevated to any post of influence and government in the University, his promotion would infallibly be attended with serious injury to religion, and with great dishonour to his Lordship. His exertions were nearly fatal to the hopes of Laud; for his statements were immediately communicated by Lord Ellesmere to the King. His designs, however, were disconcerted by the vigilant fidelity of Bishop Neile; who, fortunately, stepped in with renewed commendations of the signal abilities of Laud, and succeeded in overcoming those misgivings of his Majesty, which had been excited by the allegations of the Chancellor.

Nevertheless, much difficulty still remained to be encountered. At the time of the election,

^{1611.}
May 10. Laud was confined in London, with an illness so serious, as to disable him even from writing to his friends on the subject. But, notwithstanding his absence and his silence, his appointment would have been effected without much difficulty, if the party opposed to him had not resorted to a most dis-

orderly and scandalous proceeding. It appears that among the competitors was one Rawlinson, formerly a Fellow of St. John's, and, at that time, Principal of St. Edmund's Hall. When the scrutiny was completed, and the election on the point to be declared, one of Rawlinson's supporters, perceiving that the result would certainly be favourable to Laud, suddenly snatched the scrutiny-paper, and, in a moment, tore it to pieces. By this outrage, some doubt was thrown upon the regularity of his election, and the matter was referred, by appeal, to the decision of the King. No pains were spared by the enemies of Laud, in taking a base advantage of their own wrong. But their projects were, happily, confounded by the royal justice. His Majesty sat to dispose of the cause in person, on the 29th of August, at Tichburne, in Hampshire, on his return from a progress in the western parts of the kingdom: and, after a patient hearing of three hours, he confirmed the election of Laud, and decreed his admission to the Headship. On the Michaelmas following, the order was carried into execution; and Laud was immoveably seated in the Presidentship of St. John's¹.

It was not to be imagined that even the sentence of the King would silence, in an instant, the voice of turbulence and disaffection in the College. Laud himself allows that, for some time after his election,

¹ Heylyn, p. 60, 61. And see Laud's own account of the matter, in his "Answer to the speech of Lord Say and Sele, touching the Liturgy," in 1641; p. 474. ed. 1695. Also his Diary, p. 3, in which he writes, that Lord Ellesmere was incited against him by Dr. Abbot, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury elect: and afterward adds, "The Archbishop of Canterbury was the original cause of all my troubles."

the faction which had resisted his appointment "continued very eager and bitter against him;" and their consciousness of sympathy in higher quarters, assisted to keep alive the spirit of malevolence. In the course of a few months, however, he succeeded in restoring peace to the society. His election took place in May; and the following November afforded him an opportunity of displaying such patience and moderation in the choice of College officers,, as deprived his ill-wishers of all pretence for persisting in their opposition. His success, too, in this respect, was not only complete, but permanent. It was his boast that, during the whole period of his Presidency, which was near upon eleven years, the College never experienced the slightest interruption of its tranquillity; and, for the truth of this averment, he publicly appealed, in the days of his adversity, to the knowledge of many individuals of eminent worth in the Church, who were able and ready to avouch it¹.

There was one part of his conduct, more especially, which could scarcely fail to disarm the hatred even of those who had been most forward to injure him. For the sake of example, it was necessary that some punishment should be inflicted on Bayley, the individual who had torn the scrutiny-paper. Laud, however, perceiving him to be a young man of promising talent, steady application, and intrepid temper, thought it wiser, as well as more charitable,

¹ See his "Answer to Lord Say and Sele, on the Liturgy," at the end of the History of his Troubles, &c. p. 474; where he vindicates himself from the disparaging assertion, that "his comprehensions went no further than to carry on a side in a College."

to win him by kindness, than to confirm him in his alienation by severity. He accordingly released him from the censure inflicted upon him, as soon as was consistent with propriety; and, not content with this, he bestowed upon the man his favour and his confidence; and, at length, made him his Chaplain, advanced him in the Church, married him to his brother's daughter, and, eventually, obtained his promotion to that very Presidentship which he had endeavoured to snatch from Laud, and, with it, to one of the best Deaneries in the kingdom¹.

For the next four years, the life of Laud presents little of interest or importance. The only additional mark of favour conferred upon him, during that period, was his appointment to a Royal Chaplaincy, in November, 1611. His friend and patron, Neile, then Bishop of Lichfield, it is true, never, for a moment, relaxed in his kindness. In his house, Laud was always domesticated, whenever he had occasion to visit London; and, if his influence had been predominant, the President of St. John's would have been speedily advanced to a more eminent position. But, unhappily, the Primate, George Abbot, was constantly on the watch, to intercept the royal favour. He laboured to keep fresh in his Majesty's recollection those fatal indications of a Popish heart, which had made the President an object of suspicion and dislike at Oxford; and never failed to dwell upon his criminal weakness in uniting Lady Rich with her guilty paramour, the Earl of Devonshire. For a considerable time, the success with which Abbot

¹ Heylyn, p. 60, 61.

plied these evil offices was all that he could desire. For nearly four years together Laud remained stationary ; till, at last, he began to lose all hope of further advancement, and entertained serious thoughts of devoting the remainder of his life wholly to the government of his College. The friendship of Neile, however, overpowered this resolution. At the urgent request of the Bishop, Laud consented to postpone his retirement for another year. In the mean time he had received the Prebend of Buckden April, 1614. from his Patron, who had been promoted to the See of Lincoln; and, in December, 1615, was appointed by him to the Archdeaconry of Huntingdon¹.

It was during this interval that Laud was exposed to a trial of his patience much more severe than any which he had yet been fated to experience. It chanced that, in the course of a Sermon preached by him before the University, on Shrove Tuesday, 1614, he had ventured on some expressions bitterly offensive to the Presbyterians. It also happened that the Vice-Chancellor, for that year, was Dr. Robert Abbot, a brother of the Archbishop, by whose interest he had obtained the Rectorship of Exeter College. Robert Abbot was a man of conspicuous learning; but, in some respects, according to the judgment of many, a person of very suspicious moderation. A Calvinist, indeed, he was; but his Calvinism was of a degenerate growth, compared with that which had long been predominant at Oxford. The Predestination which he preached was only of the *Sublapsarian* grade; and was, therefore, an object of displeasure and contempt

¹ Heylyn, p. 64, 65. Diary, p. 3.

with the *Supralapsarian* Divines. But, whatever might be his defects in matters of pure theology, there was not a Puritan of them all more thoroughly *orthodox* than he, in his opinion of Laud. In this respect, at least, he was a perfect representative of his brother, the Primate. He had now a conspicuous opportunity of putting forth his sentiments. On the Easter day which followed, he preached at St. Peter's, in the afternoon, and his Sermon was so obviously directed against the Preacher of Shrove Tuesday, that it was impossible for any one of the congregation to mistake the individual at whom he aimed. At this exhibition, Laud himself was not present. His friends, however, thought it due to his reputation that he should boldly make his appearance at St. Mary's, on the following Sunday; on which day, conformably to the ancient custom of the University, the same Sermon would be repeated. Laud, though not without some reluctance, consented: and the consequence was that, according to his own account of the matter to Bishop Neile, "he was fain to sit patiently, and hear himself abused, almost an hour together; being pointed at as he sat¹."

This circumstance is well worthy of attention, not only because it illustrates the spirit which never ceased to persecute him, till it brought him to the scaffold, but, also, because it shows what were some of the opinions, then stigmatized as treasonable to the Protestant faith. The following is a specimen of the language of the assailant:—

"Some," said the preacher, "are partly Romish

¹ Rushw. vol. i. p. 62.

and partly English, as occasion serves them ; that a man may say unto them, *Noster es, an adversariorum?* who, under pretence of truth, and preaching against the *Puritan*, strike at the heart and root of the Faith and Religion now established among us¹. They cannot plead that they are accounted Papists, because they speak against the Puritan ; but, because, being indeed Papists, they speak nothing against them. If they do, at any time, speak any thing against the Papists, they do but beat a little about the bush, and that but softly, too, for fear of waking and disquieting the birds that are in it. They speak nothing but that, wherein one Papist will speak against another ; as against Equivocation, and the Pope's temporal authority, and the like ; and perhaps some of their blasphemous speeches. But, in the points of *Free Will, Justification, Concupiscence being a sin after Baptism, Inherent Righteousness, and*

¹ This is precisely in harmony with Archbishop Abbot's description of Laud : " His life in Oxford was to pick quarrels in the lectures of the public readers, and to advertise them to the then Bishop of Durham (Neile), that he might fill the ears of King James with discontents against the honest men that took pains in their places, and *settled the truth* (which he called *Puritanism*), in their auditors. He made it his work to see what books were in the press, and to look over epistles dedicatory, and prefaces to the reader, to see what faults were to be found. It was an observation, what a *sweet man* this was like to be," &c. &c. See Abbot's Narrative, Rushw. vol. i. p. 440.

These are evidently the words of an inveterate enemy. It is probable enough that Laud, when at Oxford, kept a watchful eye upon the sermons and publications of the time. The only question is, whether he was prompted to do this by a quarrelsome temper, or by a dread of the tendency of the prevalent opinions. And this is a question which no impartial reader will be content to leave to the decision of Archbishop Abbot.

certainty of Salvation, the Papists beyond the sea can say they are wholly theirs; and the Recusants at home make their brags of them. And, in all things, they keep so near the brink, that, upon any occasion, they may step over to them. Now, for this speech, that the Presbyterians are as bad as the Papists, there is a sting in the speech which I wish had been left out; for there are many Churches beyond the seas which contend for the Religion established among us, and yet have approved and admitted the Presbytery." Then, after some sentences in vindication of the Presbyterian Discipline, the preacher proceeded thus: "Might not Christ say, what art thou? *Romish* or *English*? *Papist* or *Protestant*? Or what art thou? A mongrel, or compound of both? A *Protestant* by ordination; a *Papist* in point of *Free Will*, *Inherent Righteousness*, and the like? A *Protestant* in receiving the Sacrament; a *Papist* in the doctrine of the Sacrament? What, do you think there are two heavens? If there be, get you to the other, and place yourselves there. For into this, where I am, ye shall never come¹!"

This passage is extremely important and memorable. The invective of Abbot very plainly discloses to us certain of those ingredients which entered into the composition of what has been sometimes complained of by the vindicators of Puritanism, as the *Semi-Protestant* Divinity of those days. And this disclosure must be kept steadily in mind, if we would duly estimate the justice of the charge, that, among the theologians of James and Charles, several were guilty of a perfidious approximation to the Romish

¹ Heylyn, p. 65, 67. Rushw. vol. i. p. 62.

scheme of doctrine. To exalt the Eucharist above a mere act of commemoration, to maintain the freedom of the human will, to doubt whether or not the elect are favoured with a full and perfect assurance of salvation, all these were infallible symptoms of a relapse into superstition and corruption¹! Every step *from* Calvinism was held to be *towards* Popery. All who were not fixed and stationary at Geneva, were denounced as meditating a desertion to Rome. By artifices like these, it was that the character of *Papist* was made to adhere to Laud so closely, that he could no more shake it off, than he could escape from his own shadow. Let him say or do what he would, he was still, manifestly, no other than a servant of Anti-Christ!

1614. It will easily be imagined that the spirit of Laud was sorely galled by this public insult. On the very next day he dispatched an account of the affair to Bishop Neile; and requested his directions as to the course which it became him to pursue². On the one hand, his silence under the

¹ Much in the same spirit is the speech of Serjeant Wilde against Laud, on his impeachment. With reference to the alleged design of a reconciliation, he says, "A bead-roll of particulars might be recited wherein this reconcilment was to be wrought in the points of *Free Will, Merit, Justification, Universal Grace, Purgatory*; and, in effect, all the rest." Cobbett's State Trials, vol. iv. p. 355.

² In his letter to Neile, Laud writes thus,—“For this present abuse, I would have taken no notice of it, but that the whole University apply it to me; and my own friends tell me that I shall sink my credit, if I answer not Dr. Abbot in his own. Nevertheless, in a business of this kind, I will not be swayed from a patient course. Only, I desire your Lordship to vouchsafe to me some direction what to do,” &c. Rushw. vol. i. p. 62.

affront might be capable of a construction highly injurious to his reputation ; while, on the other, it might be imprudent to take any step which would further exasperate his old enemies, or raise up a swarm of new ones. What was the advice given him by Neile, is not known. It is certain, however, that Laud remained inactive ; so that the counsels of his friend were, probably, of a pacific nature. The man who had assailed him was, soon afterwards, removed from Oxford, by his promotion to the Bishopric of Salisbury : and this circumstance may, possibly, have furnished an additional reason for abstinence from further quarrel¹.

Laud had now completed his 43d year ; and, hitherto, he had not been honoured ^{1616.} November. with any promotion in the Church, which was sufficient to place him, in the public eye, among the rising ecclesiastics of the time. And, if he was impatient for wealth, his first step towards high preferment must have been unsatisfactory enough ; for, in the month of November, 1616, the King conferred on him the impoverished Deanery of Gloucester² ; a dignity which, nearly five years after, was described by James himself, as “ a shell without a kernel³ ;” but, for which he, nevertheless, resigned his living of West Tilbury⁴. Unfortunately, too, it was a position which brought him once more into conflict with the fanaticism of the day. There was not a Church in the kingdom which exhibited in more ample measure, the *peculiarities* of the Calvinistic discipline. Every thing was in a state of scandalous disorder.

¹ Heylyn, p. 68.

² Diary, p. 3.

³ Diary, p. 4. An. 1621.

⁴ Ibid. p. 4.

The cathedral was falling to decay : the worship was assimilated, as nearly as might be, to the service of a Conventicle. So notorious, in short, were the irregularities which had long prevailed, that they had excited the attention and the displeasure of the King: and Laud departed for Gloucester, armed, not only with his own zeal and resolution, but with the strongest injunctions of his Majesty to effect a searching reformation. The first measure of Laud was to assemble the Chapter, to lay before them his Majesty's instructions, and to procure their consent to two acts,—the one, for a speedy reparation of the fabric ; the other, for removing the communion table to the east of the choir, and placing it against the wall, conformably to the usage of other Cathedral Churches. He, further, recommended to the Clergy, and to the subordinate officers of the Church, the practice of a reverent obeisance on entering the choir ; a custom which, at that period, was generally observed, in the chapels of the King, and of many among the first nobility in the land. But, notwithstanding the acquiescence of the Clergy, the difficulties which Laud had still to encounter were numerous and formidable. The Bishop of Gloucester, at that time, was Dr. Miles Smith, who owed his advancement to his reputation for Hebrew learning, and to his useful labours as one of the Translators of the Bible. It is painful to reflect that one, who had such substantial claims to public respect, should be found in bitter opposition to the redress of the abuses which deformed his own Cathedral. Such, however, was the fact : Smith, unhappily, was an inflexible Calvinist ; and so fierce was his resistance to the restoration of order, that, when he heard of the directions, given by Laud, for

the removal of the communion-table, he vowed that, if the Dean should persist in these *innovations*, he would never more enter the walls of the Church. And, to this resolution, it is said, he faithfully adhered to the day of his death.

It appears that the Bishop had a Chaplain, named White, who was quite as untractable as himself, and much more openly turbulent. This man, in the plenitude of his zeal, took upon himself to address an inflammatory letter to the Chancellor of the Diocese ; in which he bitterly complained of the proceedings of the Dean, and the tame submission of the Chapter ; and expressed his astonishment that not one among them should be found, with a spark of the spirit of Elias in his bosom, to speak a word in God's behalf. The Epistle in question soon got abroad ; a copy of it was thrown into the pulpit of St. Michael's Church, where the Sub-dean usually was the preacher. The parish clerk, having found it there, placed it in the hands of the Curate. By the Curate it was communicated to others. Copies of it were speedily multiplied. The paper thus became divulged all over the city, which then swarmed with Puritans. A cry against Popery was raised among the populace : and such was the tumult and confusion, that it became necessary for the Magistracy to commit the most violent to prison ; to threaten others with the exaction of security for their peaceable behaviour ; and even to take measures for strengthening the local authorities by a reference to the Court of High Commission. In this stage of the matter, the Dean addressed the Bishop of Gloucester, by letter, requesting his aid in the control of " such tongues and pens as knew not how to submit to any law but their

own ;” and stating that, if such outrages were not instantly suppressed, it would become his duty to represent the whole of these transactions to the King¹. He had but little expectation, however, that the Bishop would be very active in the redress of mischiefs, of which his own Chaplain had been the prime mover. He, therefore, despatched a letter to the Bishop of Lincoln ; in which he requested that his Lordship would render him such lawful assistance and support, as might enable him (the Dean) to vindicate the insulted discipline of the Church². It was some time before the firmness of Laud was rewarded by the restoration of peace and order. In the course of less than a twelvemonth, however, he had the satisfaction to find that the fury of the populace had gradually sunk before the terrors of the law, and that the disorders were effectually reformed. But then, the reformer went forth more indelibly branded than ever with the mark of an incorrigible and malignant *Papist*³ !

No sooner had Laud placed the concerns of his Deanery in a course of due correction, than he found himself engaged in another project of reformation, which eventually furnished one more tributary stream to the torrent of hatred that at last overwhelmed him. The insult which had been levelled at him by Abbot, from the pulpit of St. Mary's, was reported by the Bishop of Lincoln to the King ; and was represented to him as one, among other formidable symptoms, of the danger which was threatened both to the Church and the State, by the

¹ Cant. Doom. p. 77.

² Ibid.

³ Heylyn, p. 69. &c. 75. Cant. Doom. p. 78.

uncontrolled predominance of the Calvinistic principles at the University. It was further submitted to his Majesty, that much evil had arisen from a relaxation in the practice of demanding subscription to the three Articles contained in the 36th Canon ; since many lecturers, and other preachers in and near the University, had been encouraged, by this remissness, to venture on the promulgation of doctrines, which were not maintained or allowed by the Church of England. After much attentive consideration, the King gave his sanction to certain Articles, drawn up by the advice of such of the Bishops and Clergy as were then about the court ; and, on the 18th
of January, 1617, dispatched them to the ^{1617.} authorities at Oxford, for immediate enforcement. The principal points insisted on in these regulations, were, that the three articles of Canon 36 should be subscribed by all who were admitted to any degree ; that the students should not desert St. Mary's for any other Church ; that students in divinity should confine themselves to the writings of fathers, schoolmen, and councils, and to works of controversy and ecclesiastical history ; that no man, either in the pulpit or the schools, maintain dogmatically any thing not allowed by the Church of England ; that the Vice-chancellor, Proctors, or two Heads of Houses, give an account to his Majesty, of the obedience rendered to these instructions ; and, lastly, that transgressors should be censured according to the statutes of the University.

The consternation spread by this document among the Puritans is scarcely to be imagined. If a conspiracy for the suppression of Christianity had been detected, the clamour could hardly have been more

loud and passionate. The agitation did not wholly subside for many years. In 1636, the hateful articles were called up in judgment against their reputed author, by Dr. Burton, of Friday-street; who numbered them among the *innovations* introduced by Laud, together with others of the Prelatical party, for the subversion of all true religion. By some it has been thought that there was, in these directions,

1617. a vigour beyond the law, even as the law was then understood; and that their tendency was to make the King, not merely the visitor, but the dictator of the University, and to place its whole system of study and discipline at the discretion of the Crown. After all, however, the injunctions in question cannot reasonably be regarded in any other light than that of a Royal Proclamation, calling upon the Universities to act steadily up to the spirit of their own laws and regulations¹. That any

¹ It is well known that, on the 13th of June, 1613, a letter had been addressed by the King to the University of Cambridge, in which he signified his pleasure that it might be ordained and decreed by them, that no man should thenceforth have granted to him the degree of Bachelor in Divinity, or of Doctor in any Faculty,—Divinity, Law, or Physic,—unless he should first subscribe the three articles in 36th Canon: adding, that, as he understood, the University of Oxford had long since made a public ordinance and constitution in that behalf; “in so much that they granted not so much as the degree of a Bachelor of Arts, without subscription first had.” And it is further notorious, that, on the 7th of July, 1613, a grace was passed by the senate of the University of Cambridge, strictly conformable to the tenor of his Majesty’s Letter; which grace became, of course, a part of the Academic Law. This was followed on the 3d of December, 1616, by the Royal Injunctions above mentioned, which are somewhat more comprehensive than the former, in exacting subscription; for they require that “all who take *any*

design to enslave those seats of learning was deliberately formed by the King, or his clerical advisers, is altogether incredible. The alarm, which dictated the articles, was, to say the least, as sincere as that which the same articles excited; and the events which followed are sufficient to shew that it was much better founded. But, be this as it may, the sound of the proclamation was far more awful than its immediate effects. For, though it was duly published, it appears that it was almost left to execute itself; and that no very active measures for its execution were taken, at the time, by the functionaries to whom it was addressed¹.

degree in the schools should subscribe to the three Articles." It does not appear, indeed, that these last injunctions were formally accepted by a grace to that effect. But the directions of the King were not disputed, and they were, virtually, adopted as Academic Law, by the subsequent practice of the University.

¹ Heylyn.

CHAPTER II.

A.D. 1617—1625.

King James's Journey to Scotland—Articles of Perth—Laud is made a Prebendary of Westminster—Is promoted to the Bishopric of St. David's—He resigns the Presidentship of St. John's—Misadventure of Archbishop Abbot—Laud takes his Seat in the House of Peers—Censure of Knight's Sermon—Royal Injunctions of 1622—Laud's Conference with the Jesuit Fisher—His intimacy with Buckingham—Beginning of his misunderstanding with Bishop Williams—Supply voted by the Convocation—Laud bitterly censured by Abbot for endeavouring to procure some indulgence for the inferior Clergy, in the period of payment—He saves the Charterhouse from Confiscation—Death of King James.

1617. THE year 1617 was remarkable for the visit of King James to Scotland. He had promised his ancient people that he would appear among them every third year. Thirteen years had now elapsed since his departure for England, and the promise remained unfulfilled; and perhaps it might have been well for his Majesty's honour, if the difficulties, which had hitherto stood in the way of its fulfilment, had remained insuperable. The more immediate motive which prompted him to the journey, was his ardent and not unnatural desire to assimilate, in all respects, the religious establishment of Scotland with that of England. In the year 1612, Episcopacy had been set up again in Scotland; but the Scottish Communion was still unprovided either with a Liturgy, or a body of Canons, or a National Con-

fession of Faith. This was a state of things which James was unable to endure. He could not rest until he had made a vigorous effort for bringing the Articles of belief, the discipline, and the ritual, of his Northern dominions to the nearest practicable conformity with those of the Anglican Church. And, instead of leaving this approximation to be gradually and quietly attempted by the prudence and watchfulness of the Scottish Prelates, he resolved that it should be brought to pass by the personal exercise of his own princely wisdom and sovereign authority. To dwell at much length on this very unsatisfactory experiment, would be to intrude on the province of general history. Some brief notice of it is, however, indispensable, in a biography of Laud.

It was held to be a matter of the highest importance to the success of this attempt, that the King should be attended by English Divines of such experience, ability, and learning, as should fit them for an encounter with the Presbyterians of Scotland, if the affair should be found to involve the necessity of a disputation. The natural endowments and ample erudition of Laud, marked him for one among the worthy representatives of English theology on this occasion. The personal cost of such an expedition, he was aware would be heavy. But this was a consideration altogether valueless, when compared with the satisfaction of honourably standing forward in the service of his Church and his Sovereign. On his Majesty's arrival at Edinburgh, it soon became manifest that he might have well spared himself the care bestowed by him on the selection of his chaplains! The first greeting which his Majesty received, was the report of a sermon delivered by one Struthers, in

the presence of Laud and the rest of the Royal Chaplains. In this very uncourtly exposition, the preacher vehemently denounced all projects for an ecclesiastical uniformity between the two kingdoms: and, not content with this, he burst forth into invective against the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England, and prayed God to save Scotland from the same. Finding that little was to be done by reasoning, or prerogative, the King had recourse to a somewhat less dignified, but much more effective expedient. He suspended the allowances which he had formerly assigned to the preachers out of his Exchequer. This line of argument was found, beyond all comparison, more persuasive than any to which his Majesty had yet resorted. It produced, in the following year, the celebrated assembly of Perth, and the ratification of the five Articles which bear its name. By these Articles it was agreed,—1. That the holy Communion should be received by the people kneeling: 2. That it might be privately administered, in cases of sickness: 3. That Baptism, also, might be privately administered in cases of necessity: 4. That the birth, passion, resurrection, and ascension of the Saviour, and the coming down of the Holy Ghost, should be publicly solemnized: and, 5. That children above eight years of age should receive Episcopal confirmation¹.

These forced concessions were but a sorry earnest of any future coalition between the two Churches. Indeed, the whole royal expedition was little more

¹ Heylyn, p. 73, 74, 78, 79. These five Articles may be seen at length, in their original terms, in Dr. Russell's *History of the Church in Scotland*, vol. ii. p. 108—111.

than a prologue to the fearful drama which was acted twenty years afterwards, under James's unfortunate successor. On the termination of it, Laud obtained permission to go direct to Oxford, instead of attending the King in his more circuitous route. On the 2nd of August he took possession of the Rectory of Ibstock, a living within the patronage of the Bishop of Rochester, of whom he received it, in exchange for his Kentish benefice of Norton. On his arrival at his college, he was greeted with a cordial welcome by his friends; and, what was still more gratifying, he there received intelligence of the pacific termination of the disorders at his Deanery of Gloucester.

The next symptom of his treachery to the Protestant faith, was the introduction 1619. of an organ into the chapel of St. John's College¹; an *innovation* which was considered by his enemies as little better than a design to aid the incantations of the sorceress of the Seven Hills. The same year was remarkable for an attack of indisposition, which threatened, at the time, to deprive his adversaries of all further opportunity of annoyance. On a journey from London to Oxford, he stopped at an inn in the town of Wickham; and, there, was seized with a fit, the severity of which is indicated by his own words, that "he suddenly fell dead²." "But God revived him," his biographer observes, "to a life more eminent, and a death more glorious³." His progress towards an "eminent life," however, had hitherto

¹ Lloyd's Memoirs, &c. p. 228.

² Diary, p. 4, ad An. 1619, Ap. 2.

³ Heylyn, p. 83.

been singularly slow. It was not till January, 1621¹, that he came into possession of the Stall at Westminster, the reversion of which had been promised him ten years before. He was, at this time, in the 48th year of his age; so that the prime and vigour of his manhood were passed. Up to this time, therefore, his advancement was by no means correspondent to his high reputation. What may have been the value of his successive parochial incumbencies, it would be difficult to ascertain. But, if Clarendon may be credited, his chief preferment, the Presidentship of St. John's, was no more than sufficient "to give him bread²." At court, he was regarded rather as a retainer of Neile (now Bishop of Durham) than as a servant of the King³. His old detractor, Archbishop Abbot, had been constantly on the spot, sitting cross-legged (if the phrase may be allowed) upon the fortunes of the *Papist*, and providing him with abundant opportunities of shewing how well he could endure the pains of hope deferred, which maketh the heart sick.

But the time was now come, when, in spite of all obstruction, he was to be promoted to the Bench. On the 29th of June, the King signified his pleasure that Laud should occupy the See of St. David's. For this advancement he is said to have been indebted to the friendly recommendation of the Marquess of Buckingham, and of Bishop Williams. But there is great reason to suspect that the good offices of Williams were considerably quickened by his own desire to

¹ January, 1620, according to the old style. See Diary, p. 4.

² Clarend. vol. i. p. 160, Oxf. 1826.

³ Heylyn, p. 85.

retain the Deanery of Westminster, which he then held; a preferment which, it was confidently surmised, would devolve upon Laud¹, and which he probably would have preferred to a remote and impoverished Bishopric. The interest of Bishop Williams was, at that period, in high ascendancy. On the 10th of June, he had been sworn as a Privy Counsellor, and nominated to the See of Lincoln. On the 10th of July, he was honoured with the custody of the Great Seal, on the deprivation of the Lord Chancellor, the illustrious Francis Bacon. He was, further, allowed to retain, in *commendam* with the See of Lincoln, that very Deanery at Westminster, which the general expectation had assigned to Laud, and, with it, his other ample preferments: namely, a Prebendal Stall, and the office of a Residentiary, in his own Cathedral Church of Lincoln; and the Rectory of Walgrave, in Northamptonshire. So that, now, as Heylyn observes, "he was a perfect diocese within himself; as being Bishop, Dean, Prebendary, Residentiary, and Parson, and all these at once²!" It must be allowed, that these circumstances tend strongly to confirm the suspicion, that this Leviathan of preferment, when he bestirred himself for Laud's promotion to St. David's, was anxious, chiefly for the removal of a competitor, and "shewed himself more a politician than a friend³."

If we are to credit the account of this promotion,

¹ Diary, p. 4.

² They who may be curious to know his reasons for keeping all these preferments, may find them, pretty much at length, in Hacket's Life of Williams, p. 62, 63.

³ These are the words of Anthony Wood, vol. iii. p. 123. ed. Bliss. See also Laud's Diary, p. 4, and Heylyn, p. 85, 86.

as given by those who were unfavourable to the memory of Laud, it was not without the bitterest reluctance that the King consented to it. We are told by the biographer of Bishop Williams, that Laud had already "*fastened* on the Marquess of Buckingham, to be his mediator; whom he had made sure by great observances¹; but that the Archbishop of Canterbury had so opposed him, and represented him with suspicion"—(in the judgment of the biographer, *improbably grounded*)—"of unsoundness in religion, that the Lord Marquess was at a stand, and could not get the Royal assent to the promotion." Buckingham, however, was not to be diverted from his purpose; and he was rendered the more inflexible by the "sour and supercilious" demeanour of the Archbishop, in his opposition to the appointment. His

¹ An infamous and execrable story is related by Roger Coke, which would make it disgraceful for any one, who could believe it true, to undertake the biography of Laud. It is affirmed by that writer, that Laud applied to Buckingham for his interest, towards procuring for him the Bishopric of St. David's; that Buckingham received the applicant, in the morning, before he had left his bed; that he replied to the request by observing that he (Laud) had a bad name for his excessive pride; and that Laud assured the Marquess that, on the contrary, he was the humblest man alive. "I'll try that," rejoined the Marquess; and thereupon ordered his suitor to crawl, several times, both under the bed, and over the bed, in which his Lordship was lying with one of his mistresses. With this order, it is averred, Laud immediately complied. Upon which Buckingham said, "Now I believe you; and you shall have the Bishopric of St. David's." If this were fact, Laud would be one of the most abject and despicable of human beings. It would be ignominious to waste a word or a thought upon him. But the whole story is utterly incredible. See Roger Coke's *Detection*, &c. p. 123. ed. 1697.

Lordship, accordingly, conjured Williams to stand forward as the advocate for Laud: an office which he did not hesitate to undertake, on the first favourable opportunity. The reply of the King was as follows:—"Well, I perceive whose attorney you are. *Stenny* hath set you on. You have pleaded the man a good Protestant, and I believe it. Neither did that stick in my breast, when I stopped his promotion. But was there not a certain lady who forsook her husband, and married a Lord that was her paramour? Who knit that knot? Shall I make a man a Prelate, one of the angels of my Church, who hath a flagrant crime upon him?"—"Sir," said the Lord Keeper, "you are a good master; but who will dare serve you, if you will not pardon one fault, though of a scandalous size, to him that is heartily penitent for it? I pawn my faith to you that he is heartily penitent; and there is no other blot that hath sullied his good name." "You press well," said the King, "and I hear you with patience. Neither will I revive a trespass which repentance hath mortified and buried. And, because I see that I shall not be rid of you, unless I tell you my unpublished cogitations, the plain truth is, I keep Laud back from all place of rule and authority, because I find that he hath a restless spirit, and cannot see when matters are well, but loves to toss and change, and to bring things to a pitch of reformation, floating in his own brain, which may endanger the stedfastness of that which is at a good pass, God be praised. I speak not at random: he hath made himself known to me to be such a one. For, when three years past, I had obtained of the Assembly of Perth to consent to five

articles of order and decency, in a correspondence with this Church of England, I gave them promise that I would try their obedience no further, *anent* ecclesiastical affairs. Yet this man hath pressed me to invite them to a nearer conjunction with the Liturgy and Canons of this nation: but I sent him back again, with the frivolous draught which he had drawn. And now your importunity hath compelled me to shrive myself thus unto you; I think you are at your furthest, and have no more to say for your client."—"May it please you, Sir," replied Williams, "I will speak but this once. You have convicted your Chaplain of an attempt very audacious, and very unbecoming. My judgment goes quite against his; yet I submit this to your sacred judgment: that Dr. Laud is of a great and tractable wit. He did not well see how he came into this error; but he will presently see the way how to come out of it. Some diseases, which are very acute, are quickly cured." "And is there no *whoe*, but you must carry it?" said the King: "Then take him to you; but, on my soul, you will repent it!" and so went away in anger, using other words of fierce and ominous import, too *tart* to be repeated¹.

Such is the recital of Bishop Hacket. We are in no condition to call in question the occurrence of this curious scene. It is, indeed, far from improbable, that James may have seen enough of the proposed Bishop's impetuous temperament, to raise some occasional and serious misgivings, as to the expediency of his elevation to the Bench. But still it is difficult to reconcile the alleged vehemence of his opposition

¹ Hacket's Life of Williams, Pt. i. p. 63, 64.

to the measure, with one undoubted fact, which seems to indicate that Laud was still in full and secure possession of the Royal favour,—namely, that he was honoured by his Majesty with permission to retain the Presidentship of St. John's College, *in commendam* with his Bishopric. Of this licence, however, it should be remembered, to his honour, he forbore to take advantage. The Bishopric was poor enough to render the arrangement exceedingly desirable. But, he himself has recorded the motive for his abstinence. His words are “By reason of the strictness of the statute, which I will not violate, nor my oath to it, under any colour, I am resolved, before my consecration, to leave it.” And he did leave it, accordingly, on the 17th of June, 1621, the very day before his consecration¹.

This consecration had been delayed for several months, by an untoward occurrence which befel Archbishop Abbot. Being on a visit to Lord Zouch, at Bramshill Park, in Hampshire, his Grace was prevailed on to attend a hunting party to the field, and even to take a cross-bow in his hand. His bad marksmanship, though not at all discreditable to his sacred profession, was, unhappily, fatal to one of the keepers, ; for, in shooting at a deer, it so chanced that “he missed the beast and shot the man.” The accident was one which might have befallen the most

¹ Diary, p. 4. an. 1621. Surely this fact should be recollected by those enemies to the name of Laud, who, at this day, scruple not to charge him with a want of all sense of duty to God and man. Laud's resignation of the Presidentship of St. John's was unknown to Heylyn, who had not access to Laud's Diary, but only to Prynne's infamous *Breviate*, in which the above passage is omitted.

experienced sportsman. But it was an awkward incident in the life of a Churchman : more especially of one who was at the head of a party professing more than ordinary strictness of conversation. The scandal occasioned by the circumstance will scarcely be credited in these days. Many of the most learned and conscientious Divines lamented it with bitter tears. They considered our Church as dishonoured by it, in the eyes of all Christendom. It was a matter of serious doubt among them, whether the shedding of blood, although purely accidental, did not utterly disqualify a Bishop for the performance of any sacred office. Nay, the fact afforded matter of officious discussion to the foreign Universities. The Doctors of the Sorbonne, after three solemn disputations, resolved that it amounted to a clear canonical *irregularity*; in other words, to a fatal incapacity for the exercise of all ecclesiastical authority or jurisdiction ! The Archbishop himself, was nearly inconsolable. He retired to Guildford, to await the issue of this disastrous misadventure. The circumstance, of course, produced considerable agitation throughout the court of James. It was generally surmised that the eye of Dr. Williams was steadily fixed upon the Primacy : and the *irregularity* of Abbot, if judicially established, might probably make straight the way for the aspirations of that ambitious Churchman. An immensity of erudition was expended upon the question, by the Civilians and the Canonists : and, for some time, it was uncertain whether the See of Canterbury would not be vacated by "the hunting of that day." The Canons, on examination, were found to be so vaguely worded, and open to so much subtilty of distinction,

that the Commissioners, to whom the matter was referred, protested that they were "unable to return to his Majesty any unanimous resolution or opinion." In one thing, however, they were all agreed: not only that a restitution or dispensation might be granted by his Majesty, under the Great Seal; or, (which, in all humility, they recommended) by the hands of certain Clergymen delegated for that purpose. And, at all events, they were of opinion that the Reverend Father should sue unto his Majesty for such dispensation, as a measure of needful precaution, lest there should have been any *irregularity* incurred. Conformably to this report, the dispensation was applied for, and obtained, in the shape recommended by the Commissioners. And this proceeding received afterwards the sanction of that great oracle of the common law, Sir Edward Coke. When the question was put to him, by Sir Henry Saville, whether a Bishop might hunt in a park, by the laws of the realm?—he replied, that a Bishop might do so, by this very token,—that there is an old law that a Bishop, when dying, is to leave his pack of dogs to the King's use and disposal. And it might reasonably be concluded that, if the King was to have the dogs when the Bishop died, the Bishop might make use of them, when he was alive¹.

¹ Heylyn, p. 87, 88. Coll. Eccl. Hist. vol. ii. 721, 722. The Royal Dispensation is in the same volume, in the Collection of Records, No. cviii. Collier is, evidently, much scandalized, and not altogether without reason, at the royal assumption of power, on this occasion: for, whatever might be the merits of the case, it virtually overbore both the Ecclesiastical and Civil Judicature.

The remarks of Hacket on this affair are very sensible and

1621. In justice to the kindness of James's nature, it should be mentioned, that, on hearing of Abbot's misfortune, he is said to have exclaimed that, "an angel might have miscarried in that sort." He, further, addressed a letter of consolation to the Archbishop; in which he assured him that "he would not add affliction to sorrow, or take one farthing of his goods and moveables, which were forfeited by the law ¹." But neither the benevolence of his Majesty, nor the prospect of his Royal Edict, were sufficient to pacify the scruples of Laud, and the other Bishops elect, who were waiting for consecration. In common with others of their brethren, they said,—“God forbid that those hands should consecrate Bishops, and ordain Priests, or administer the Sacrament of Christ, which God, out of his secret judgments, had permitted to be imbrued in human blood.” Some of the Prelacy went so far as solemnly

acute:—"The *Decretals* and *Extravagants* un-bishop a man, that killed a man, and meant a beast; nay, further, if a Bishop's horse did cast the groom that watered him into a pond, and drowned him! But, if we appeal from them to a higher and better learning, their rigour will prove ridiculous. *Irregularities*, in the superstitious Latin Church, are above number. But what have we to do with them? That we did cut them off,—we did not name it, indeed, in our reformation under Edward VI. &c.; for they were thrown out, with scorn, as not fit to be mentioned, among ejected rubbish. For we perceived they were never meant to *bind*, but to *open*,—I mean the *purse*. He that is suspended may disentangle himself from the censure with a bribe. *The Canonists are good bone-setters, for a bone that never was broken.* Their Rubrics are filled with punctilios, not for *consciencences*, but for *consciuncules*: haberdashers of small faults, and palpable brokers for fees, and mercenary dispensations." Hackett's Life of Williams, p. 65.

¹ Hackett, p. 65.

to declare, that, "if they had fallen into the like mischance, they would never have despaired of God's mercy, for the other life: but, from this world they would have retired; and besought his Majesty for a pension, to support them in their sequestered sadness, where they might spend their days in fasting and prayer." Besides, there was urgent cause to apprehend that the succession of our hierarchy would be impeached more loudly and maliciously than ever, by the Romanists, if the continuation of it were committed to hands of questionable power¹. These misgivings were respected by the King. A commission was directed by him to the Bishops of London, Worcester, Chichester, Ely, Llandaff, and Oxford. And, from them, by virtue of this Commission, Laud and the others received Episcopal Consecration, in the Chapel of London House, on Sunday, November the 18th, 1621. The Royal dispensation to the Archbishop, which Laud himself had joined in recommending, was not issued till the following December².

On the next day after his consecration, Laud took his seat in the House of Peers. The time was ominous and critical. The Commons were exceedingly untractable. James was impatient for supplies. They answered him with petitions and remonstrances,

¹ It is remarkable that Hacket does not ascribe the scruples of Laud and his brethren, to any feeling of malevolence towards Abbot. He frankly acknowledges that it became the Bishops Elect to be "most circumspect in this matter; and to be informed whether they should acknowledge the power of the Archbishop to be integral and unblemished, in a casual homicide, and submit to have his hands laid upon their heads." Hacket, pt. i. p. 66.

² Collier, vol. ii. p. 721. and Req. No. cviii.

touching the growth of Popery ; and prepared to address his Majesty with a proposal that he should take the sword into his hand against the Spaniard, and marry his son to a lady of the Reformed Religion. On hearing this, the King sent a letter to the Speaker, forbidding the House to meddle with affairs of state. But the voice which uttered the interdiction, was no longer the voice of Elizabeth. The Commons replied with their celebrated *Protestation*: in which they roundly asserted that the redress of *all* mischiefs and grievances in the realm are proper subjects of debate in Parliament ; that every member of the House is entitled to unmolested freedom of speech ; and that if any member be “ questioned for any thing done or said in Parliament, the same is to be showed to the King, by the advice and assent of all the Commons assembled in Parliament, before the King give credence to any private information.” This was a startling sound of doctrine, at that time ; however familiar it may be to modern ears. In the judgment of the King, it threatened no less, than to sever one of the strongest ligaments of his regal power ; how formidably dangerous he thought it, is manifest from the fact, that, on the 9th of January 1622, the Parliament was dissolved. The session had been a short one ; scarcely above a month. But, short as it was, it was a period of lengthened experience, in the estimate of Laud ; and doubtless helped to confirm him in the conviction,—which, with him, amounted almost to a passion,—that “ the mystery of iniquity had long been working, not so much in the Popish, as in the Puritan Faction ¹.”

1622.

¹ Heylyn, p. 92, 93.

The King, being disappointed in his hope of supply from his faithful Commons, was fain to have recourse to the liberality of his Clergy. Letters were accordingly addressed by him to the Archbishop, and all the Bishops then near London, for the purpose of raising a contribution towards the recovery of the Palatinate. On the 25th of January, the Royal application was forwarded by Laud into the Diocese of St. David's; which, as yet, he had not visited in person, and which he did not enter till the month of July following¹. On the 17th of February, he preached at Westminster; and on the 24th of March, at Court. The latter Sermon he was commanded to print². On the 16th of April, we find him engaged in a conference with his Majesty, respecting a *reasonable* Sermon, preached at Oxford, on Palm Sunday, the 24th of April, by one Mr. Knight of Broadgate Hall³, known since by the name of Pembroke College. The text of this discourse was Romans xiii. 1. *Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers, &c. &c.*; from which words the preacher contrived to extract the doctrine, that "the inferior magistrate had a lawful power to order and correct the King, if he did amiss." And, by way of illustrating the precept of St. Paul, he introduced the speech of the Emperor Trajan, to the captain of his guard,—“Take this sword; which you will draw for me, if I shall have governed well; if ill, against me⁴.” For this ingenious commentary, the man was instantly questioned by the Vice-chancellor, Dr. Pierce,

¹ Diary, p. 4, 5.

² Ibid. p. 4.

³ Ibid.

⁴ *Accipe hunc gladium: quem, pro me, si benè imperavero, distringes; sin minus, contra me.*

and ordered to deliver a copy of his Sermon : and letters were immediately despatched to Laud, the only *Oxford* Bishop then in London, requesting him to represent the matter to the King. Upon this, both the Preacher and the Discourse were sent for. The discourse turned out to be little more than a copy from *Paræus*, a divine of Heidelberg : who, in his commentary on the *Romans*, had vented precisely the same doctrine, and fortified it with the same illustration. The preacher, it appeared, was a young and inexperienced man, who might easily be misled by the authority of so grave a minister. On this account, his error was, eventually, remitted by the
 1621. King, at the suit of Bishop Williams ¹.

¹ A very entertaining account of Williams's intercession is given by his biographer. It appears that, about the same time, a Sermon had been preached, at St. Paul's, by Dr. White (then very aged), which was reported to the king to be as dangerous as that of Knight. The doctor, in great alarm, resorted to the friendly offices of the Lord Keeper. It happened that the royal instructions for the regulation of the Pulpits were just then under preparation : and Williams, one day, greatly astonished his Majesty with a grave proposal, that a proviso might be inserted in those instructions, that none of holy calling should be allowed to preach before the age of thirty years complete, nor after threescore ! "On my soul," said the King, "the Devil or some fit of madness is in the motion. For I have many great wits, and of clear distillation, that have preached before me at Royston and Newmarket, to my great liking, that are under thirty. And my Prelates and Chaplains, that are far stricken in age, are the best masters in that faculty that Europe affords."—"I agree to all this," said the Lord Keeper ; "and, since your Majesty will allow both young and old to go up into the pulpit, it is but justice that you show indulgence to the young ones, if they run into errors before their wits be settled (for, every apprentice is allowed to mar some work, before he be cunning in the mystery of his trade) ; and pity to the old ones, if some of them fall into dotage, when their brains grow dry.

His venerable seducer, however, was by no means deemed worthy of the same consideration ; for, the book of Paræus was condemned ^{1622.} to be publicly burned : and the sentence was executed accordingly, in St. Mary's Church-yard, at Oxford, on the 6th of June ; and, at St. Paul's Cross, London, on the 23rd of the same month ; on which occasion a Sermon was preached by Dr. Montaigne, then Bishop of London. The same solemnity was afterwards repeated at Cambridge. And, that the honour of the University of Oxford might be effectually redeemed from the imputation brought upon it by the indiscretion of one man, it was resolved, in Convocation, that no one should be admitted to a Degree in any faculty whatever, without taking an oath, to the effect, that he condemned from his heart the doctrine of *Paræus*, and that he would never, for the future, preach or maintain the same ¹.

From these proceedings it might naturally be inferred that the predominance of Calvinism was then

Will your Majesty conceive displeasure, and not lay it down, if the former set your teeth on edge, sometimes, before they are mellow-wise ; and if the doctrine of the latter be touched with a blemish, when they begin to be rotten, and to drop from the tree ?"—“ This is not unfit for consideration,” said the King ; “ but what do you drive at ?”—“ Sir,” said Williams, “ first to beg your pardon for mine own boldness. Then, to remember you, that Knight is a beardless boy, from whom exactness of judgment could not be expected. And, that White is a decrepit spent man, who had not a *fee-simple*, but a *lease* of Reason, and it is expired ! Both these, that have been foolish in their several extremes of years, I prostrate at the feet of your princely clemency.” Which was granted, as soon as the paradox was unriddled to pitch upon *them*.—Hacket's Life of Bishop Williams, part i. p. 88.

¹ Heylyn, p. 95, 96.

rather on the wane at Oxford. Nevertheless, measures of still closer precaution were thought necessary by the King and his advisers. It is perfectly well known that, in those times, the pulpit too often resembled a watch-tower, from which the Passions of the day delivered out their warnings and their fulminations. From the pulpit, the enthusiast declared the mysterious decrees of God; the *political* sectarian denounced the tyranny of kings; and the zealot of the Church brought railing accusations against both *Puritan* and *Papist*. The tendency to these abuses was considerably aggravated by the recent determinations of the Synod of Dort; in consequence of which, we are told, "learned and unlearned did begin to conflict, every Sunday, about God's eternal election, efficacy of grace in our conversion, and perseverance in it, with much noise, and little profit to the people¹." Such was the discord and confusion, that it was thought scarcely possible either for the Church or the State to continue in safety, if this strife of tongues should be left without control. The matter was gravely considered by his Majesty and several of his most distinguished Prelates; and the result of their deliberations was, that six injunctions were drawn up; and these, by the royal command, were despatched into every diocese, for strict and general execution. The following is the substance of these Articles:

1. That no person, under the rank of a Bishop or a Dean, should take occasion to introduce into his expositions of Scripture any matters which should not be comprehended in the Articles, or Homilies, of the Church.

¹ Hacket's Williams, part i. p. 88.

2. That the subjects of Sermons, preached by the parochial clergy, should be taken from the Catechism, the Creed, the Commandments, or the Lord's Prayer.

3. That no one, of what title soever, under the degree of a Bishop, or a Dean at the least, should presume to preach, in any popular auditory, the deep points of *Predestination, Election, Reprobation*, or of the *universality, efficacy, resistibility, or irresistibility of God's Grace*.

4. That no preacher shall, in any auditory, presume to limit, by way of positive doctrine, the authority or duty of Sovereign Princes, or to meddle with matters of state, otherwise than as they are instructed in the Articles and Homilies, more especially the Homily of Obedience; but rather confine themselves to the two heads of *Faith and Good Life*.

5. That no preacher shall fall into indecent railing against *Papists* or *Puritans*; but should, wisely and gravely, vindicate the Church from the aspersions of either.

6. That greater caution be used in the licensing of preachers; and that *Lecturers (a new body, severed from the ancient Clergy of England, as being neither Parson, Vicar, nor Curate,)* be licensed under the hand and seal of the Bishop of the Diocese, with a *fiat* from the Archbishop of Canterbury, and a confirmation under the Great Seal of England.

The above directions were to be observed by the clergy, on pain of suspension, by the Bishop of the Diocese, from office and benefice, for a year and a day, until his Majesty, by the advice of the next convocation, should prescribe some further punishment.

These six injunctions were promulgated in August 1622. And if the six sanguinary Articles of Henry VIII. had been revived, the alarm and the outcry against them could scarcely have been more passionate¹. By some it was given out, that they excluded from the scheme of public religious instruction, the most essential doctrines of the Christian Faith; by others, that they tended to scant the distribution of the bread of life, by a formidable reduction of the number of Sermons; while many deplored that a yawning breach was opened, through which ignorance and superstition would speedily rush back upon the people. It would be useless to interrupt our narrative by a discussion of the necessity, the expediency, or the legality of these directions, or to examine the reasonableness of the agitation which they excited. They have no very particular connexion with the life of Laud. It cannot, indeed, be questioned that he was among the Bishops by whose advice they were put forth. But, there is no evidence to prove that his share in their preparation was at all more prominent than that of several others: although, it certainly helped to swell the torrent of calumny against him, and to fix the multitude in a persuasion, that he was deep in a conspiracy for the re-establishment of *Popery*².

It is remarkable enough, that previous to the ap-

¹ "These orders," says Hacket, "were well brought forth. But success was the step-mother! *Destinata salubriter, omni ratione potentior fortuna discussit.* (Curtius, lib. iii.) Crossness and sturdiness took best with the vulgar; and he was counted but a *cockney* that stood in awe of his rulers." Pt. i. p. 90.

² Heylyn, p. 97. 100, where the injunctions may be seen at length.

pearance of these very Articles, the *Popish* conspirator had been engaged in a triumphant conflict with the superstition which he was accused of labouring to restore; for the early part of this same year, 1622, was memorable for Laud's immortal conference with the Jesuit Fisher. The occasion of this theological encounter may possibly appear somewhat curious, when viewed by the light of modern notions and habits. The history of the affair is as follows: While the sectarian spirit was busy among the middling and lower classes in this country, the genius of the Church of Rome was on the wing, among the more exalted regions of society. There was much, at that time, to encourage the restless emissaries of the Papacy. The King was notoriously bent upon the Spanish match. His son devoted himself to the prosecution of it with a passionate and romantic ardour. And the project was urged onward by the Marquess of Buckingham, who was afterwards the Prince's confidential guide and companion in the ridiculous adventure of the journey to Madrid. Under these circumstances, to win over the all but omnipotent statesman to the See of Rome, was, manifestly, an object well worthy of the choicest arts and resources of the school of Loyola. For, if that object were once accomplished, there could be little doubt that the Romish Creed would be favoured with the amplest toleration, when the Infanta of Spain should become the consort of the heir apparent. The first attempt, it was resolved, should be made upon the mother of the favourite; and the enterprise was entrusted principally to John Perse, a Jesuit, who usually bore the name of Fisher. His success was answerable to the most sanguine wishes

of his party. The illustrious lady was driven from her stedfastness¹; and the Jesuit was actively following up his advantage, when the matter came to the knowledge of the King. His Majesty was sorely troubled with the report of these designs and practices. For some time he took the Countess under his own especial tuition. But even the Royal Theologian was not a match for the wily Jesuit. And, finding that he sped but poorly in his task, James listened to the counsels of the Lord Keeper; who, on hearing of the lady's defection, had addressed a letter to her son upon the subject, wherein the wisdom of the children of light is curiously mixed up with the wisdom of the children of this world. "Your mother," he says, "is departed out of the bosom of the Church of England I would we could bring her home so soon, that it might not be seen she had ever wandered! It is time to let your Lordship know that the mouth of clamour is opened, that now the recusants have a potent advocate to plead for their immunity, which will in-

¹ The Countess of Buckingham doated immoderately on her son. "But yet," says Hacket, "by turning her coat so wantonly, when the eyes of all the kingdom were on his family, she could not have wrought him a worse turn, if she had studied a mischief against him. Many marvelled what *rumbled in her conscience* at that time. For, from a maid to an old madam, she had not every one's good word for practice of piety; and she suffered censure, to the last, that she left the company of Sir Thomas Compton, her husband. But why should a libertine, that cares not to live after the way of the Gospel, pretend to seek more satisfaction than ordinary, about the true doctrine of the Gospel?" (Pt. i. p. 171.) Surely Hacket could not be ignorant that a Jesuit was, of all spiritual advisers, the fittest to still the *rumbings* of her ladyship's *conscience*!

crease their number. When this is banded in the high and popular court, by the *tribunitian* orators, what a dust it will raise! . . . My Lord, your mother must be invited, or provoked, to hear debates between learned men . . . Let her Ladyship have her champions with her. Let the conferences be as solemn as can be devised, the King himself being ever present at the disputes, and the conflux of great persons as thick as the place will permit. Let your Lordship's industry and earnestness be conspicuous, &c. &c. &c. If her Ladyship recover of her unsteadiness, you have won a soul very precious to you. But, if the light within her be darkness, the notice of your Lordship's pious endeavours will fill the kingdom with a good report, and will smell to every nostril like a sweet savour. My Lord, courage¹," &c.

This counsel met with the approbation of the King. It was, accordingly, agreed that an argumentative conference should be held between the Jesuit and some competent Divine of the Church of England. The person first selected for the conflict was Dr. White, then Rector of St. Peter's, Cornhill, who had long been conspicuous for his zeal against the Romanists, and was eminently accomplished in all the arts of controversy. It was soon found that a single disputation was wholly insufficient. A second followed, which was honoured with the presence of the King himself. But, even then, the question of the visible and infallible Church remained to be discussed: this being, of all others, the point in which the Protestant doctrines appeared to the Countess

¹ Hacket, pt. i. p. 172.

to be hopelessly untenable. A third conference was, therefore, held on the 24th of May. But, in this debate, Dr. White was no longer the disputant. Laud (who had been consulted, from the first, and who held some private conversation with the Countess, both before and after the conferences) was the antagonist appointed for the last struggle with the Jesuit. And nobly did he justify the trust reposed in his ability and learning. On each of these occasions there were present the Lady herself (the prize for which the polemics were contending); her son, the Marquess of Buckingham; the Lord Keeper, Williams, who occasionally joined in the argument; and several other honourable persons of the court¹.

So far as the Countess of Buckingham was concerned, the labour of Bishop Laud and his colleague was bestowed in vain. It is true, that their arguments had a transitory success. But the convert eventually relapsed into error; in consequence of which, she declined in reputation at the court, and, at length, was banished from it, for her alleged obstinacy. The name of her son, on the contrary, derived additional lustre from the adventure. He was universally extolled, for a time, as an antagonist to the revolt of his parent, whom, nevertheless, he was known to honour with the most perfect filial duty. How little he deserved the praises heaped upon him for unshaken constancy of faith, has since been clearly ascertained. It is now known that the arts of the Jesuit had been nearly as fatal to him as to his parent; and that it required all the learning and

¹ Heylyn, p. 100, 101.

perseverance of Laud, to efface his Lordship's impressions in favour of the Romish Creed¹.

It has, however, been generally acknowledged by all Protestants, who, since that time, have most minutely examined the Popish controversy, that, in this collision, the Jesuit was demolished. But, although the achievement procured for Laud the venomous hatred of the Papists, it was unable to win for him one particle of good will from the most fanatical enemies of Rome. The cause of this is notorious. It was the avowed opinion of Laud (an opinion recorded in his publication of this very conference²), that Popery and Puritanism were as the upper and nether mill-stones; and that, between the two, the

¹ Hacket says that Buckingham "was blazed abroad for the Red Cross Knight, that was *Una's* champion against *Archimago*," p. 173. We learn from Laud that his Lordship stood in need of the services of a Red Cross Knight, nearly as much as *Una* herself! On his first day of hearing, at his trial, he said "The Right Honorable the Lord Duke of Buckingham was *almost lost* from the Church of England, by the continual cunning labours of Fisher, the Jesuit, and the persuasions of the lady, his mother. After some miscarriages, King James, of ever blessed memory, commanded me to that service. I had God's blessing upon me so far, as to *settle my Lord Duke, to his death*. And I brought the lady, his mother, to the Church again; but she was not so happy as to continue with us." *Troubles, &c.* p. 226.

² "This conference," says Wood, "was looked upon as a piece so solidly compacted, that one of our historians (L'Estrange) gives it the commendation of being the exactest master-piece of divinity extant at that time." And Sir Edward Dering, a bitter adversary of Laud's, confessed that he had *muzzled* the Jesuit, and struck the Papists under the fifth rib; that his monument should be St. Paul's (which he had laboured to repair), and that his book against Fisher should be his Epitaph. Wood, vol. iii. p. 119. Ed. Bliss. Hacket, also, allows the work to be a masterpiece, pt. i. p. 172.

Church of England was in danger of being crushed to atoms. And, hence, if he had preached a crusade against the Vatican, the Calvinists would have regarded it merely as a stratagem, to betray the people of God into the hands of her who was drunk with the blood of the Saints.

From the 6th of July to the 15th of August Laud was occupied in the visitation of his Diocese of St. David's. Finding the Episcopal House at Aberguilly unprovided with a Chapel, he ordered a waste room to be fitted up for that purpose, at his own cost: and consecrated it, according to a form drawn up by Bishop Andrews, not merely as a private oratory, but as a place of Christian worship, in the fullest sense of the term. For this, he was afterwards accused of outdoing Popery itself. The Papists, it was said, consecrated *Churches* only; but he must consecrate *Chapels!* He was, likewise, maliciously and falsely charged with lavish expenditure in the decoration of the place¹. And thus another element was added to the popular estimate of his religious principles.

The performance of Laud, in his conference with Fisher, brought him into close and confidential intercourse with Buckingham. On the 15th of June he was appointed Chaplain to the Marquess, who, on the very next day, received the Sacrament at Greenwich; and the notice of this circumstance, in the Diary of Laud, would seem to intimate that this act of *Protestant* devotion was the result of the Chap-

¹ Heylyn, p. 94, 95. Troubles, &c. Trial, &c. p. 342; from which it appears that Heylyn was partially misled in his account of the matter, by the misrepresentations of Prynne.

lain's exhortations and instructions¹. After his return from Wales, we find him again in occasional conference with the King and his ministers; and, once in the presence of Buckingham, his lady, and his mother. This intimacy contributed, like most of the prominent occurrences of his life, to fix upon him the suspicion of a treacherous design against the religion and the liberties of his country. Their intercourse was marked, with sinister and ungracious vigilance, by Archbishop Abbot, who represented Laud as "the only inward counsellor with Buckingham; sitting with him sometimes privately, whole hours, and feeding his humour with *spite and malice*." The expedition of Prince Charles and Buckingham into Spain had a still more injurious effect upon the reputation of the Bishop. It is well known that he has been charged with being accessory to the whole design; and the design itself was firmly believed by many to involve no less than the

¹ The entries in the Diary are as follow: "1622, June 9, being Whit Sunday, my Lord Marquis Buckingham was pleased to enter into a near respect to me. *The particulars are not for paper*. June 15th, I became C. to my Lord of Buckingham. And, June 16th, being Trinity Sunday, he received the Sacrament at Greenwich." It must be remarked that the initial, C, in the above entry, has generally been understood to mean *Confessor*, and is so interpreted by Heylyn. With regard to the truth of this interpretation, Laud himself speaks somewhat ambiguously. His words are, "It is said that I became C, that is, Confessor, to the Lord Duke. *If my Lord Duke would honour me so far as to make me his Confessor, as I know no sin in it, so it is abundantly proof that the passages before mentioned were not fit for paper.*" Troubles, &c. p. 382. From which we may gather that he considered himself as a confidential Chaplain and Spiritual Adviser to the Duke; but not as a Confessor in the full Romish acceptance of the word.

perversion of the Prince from the Protestant faith, and the eventual re-establishment of Popery in the realm. This suspicion is, at present, allowed to have been altogether visionary. But it cannot be denied that the King's passion for the renown of authorship had exposed him to perplexities, from which he now found it difficult to extricate himself, without some damage to his Protestant reputation. In one of his printed works, he had spoken of the Pope as Anti-Christ; an interpretation of prophecy which was found exceedingly embarrassing, when the Papal Dispensation was wanted for the Spanish match. He, accordingly, instructed the Prince to signify, to all whom it might concern, that his Majesty had written nothing on this point, by way of *conclusion*, but only by way of *argument*¹. So that the Pope might, at least, have the satisfaction of knowing, that his own identity with Antichrist was a matter still fairly open to dispute! This was weak and indiscreet enough. But the other proceedings of James, considering the temper of the times, were imminently hazardous. At a period, when the eye of Puritanism was scowling upon every shred and remnant of Popery, which it could detect in the National Church, he took upon himself to relax the statutes against Popery itself. He discharged the imprisoned Jesuits and Priests. He inhibited, or superseded all processes against Recusants. And thus he

¹ According to Laud's account, James's explanation was as follows: "I maintain not that the Pope is Anti-Christ as a point of faith, but only as a probable opinion; and for which, I have more grounds, than the Pope hath for his challenge of temporal power over Princes. Let him recal *this* opinion, and I will recal *that*." Troubles, &c. p. 375.

laid himself open to the imputation of throwing down the most essential safeguards, which had been raised for the protection of the Reformed Religion; and of doing all this, purely for the purpose of propitiating the Vatican.

The tempest of discontent, which the king had raised by these proceedings, was extremely perilous to all who were nearest to him. Of course, Laud did not escape without serious injury. His Majesty, as every one knows, had very strong didactic propensities; and these, naturally enough, were more than usually active, when his son was about to embark on a wild and perilous expedition. The paternal Lectures then administered by his Majesty, were supposed to contain much objectionable matter. And it was considered, as a thing beyond all dispute, that Laud *must* have been present at the whole course, and *must* have assisted the Royal Mentor with the weight of his prelatial authority. And not only so; but it was concluded that he *must* have been a prominent party, in the whole of the Spanish plot; and that it was his Jesuitical divinity which suggested the notion of a merely *argumentative* imputation of the character of Antichrist to the Pope¹. But there was still more cogent evidence than this to be produced, when Laud was dragged forth to the public as a Traitor. There was found among his papers, a prayer, in which he commended the Prince and his noble companion to the Divine protection; and actually begged that “the way might be cleared before

¹ If any one would see a curious specimen of muddy Logic, let him peruse the *argument* of Prynne; by which he demonstrates that Laud *must* have been a prime mover in these theological and political intrigues. *Canterbury's Doom.* p. 276.

them, *in their great adventure*¹." With this document before him, no good Protestant could entertain a doubt as to the purpose for which the *great adventure* was undertaken! Argument or ridicule would be wasted on reasoning like this. But, in addition to the above evidence, it came out, at last, that Laud had maintained a correspondence with Buckingham, during his absence from England. What was the subject of this correspondence, is by no means absolutely certain: for not a fragment of it has been preserved. That it had any reference to the Spanish alliance, or its apprehended results, is wholly matter of conjecture. The probability, however, is that it related chiefly, if not entirely, to the personal interests of Buckingham himself. The favourite was too well acquainted with Courts, to be ignorant that his power might be seriously endangered by his absence. He was, therefore, naturally anxious to have some friends on the spot, who might faithfully report to him whatever symptoms might be discernible, of his declining influence at Court. And it is not unlikely that Laud was one among the persons to whom he entrusted the execution of this good office. He had, of late, bestowed the most unreserved confidence on the Bishop. And Laud, on his part, was deeply interested for the honour of a nobleman, who had won him by kindness, and perhaps, had overpowered his better judgment by the force of brilliant, but unsubstantial qualities. The fact of his correspondence with Buckingham, Laud never attempted to deny. On the contrary, he avowed at his trial, that he considered it as a great honour. "I have com-

¹ Prynne, Breviat. p. 14. Heylyn, p. 107.

mitted," he adds, "*some* error in these Letters, or *none*. If *none*, why are they charged? If *any*, why are they not produced; that I may see what is, and answer it¹?" The anticipations of Buckingham did not deceive him. If we may judge by the promptness of the Bishop's first communication, (dated on the fourth day after Buckingham's departure²;) no sooner had the favourite quitted the shores of England, than the royal ear was assailed by whispers and murmurings to his disadvantage. It has been affirmed, that the Lord Keeper Williams was prominently active against the favourite³. And it is certain, that soon after the return of Buckingham from Spain, there were manifest symptoms of alienation between him and the Lord Keeper. It is equally certain, that, about the same time, commenced the rupture between Williams and Laud, which afterwards became irreparable.

It would be a perplexing and repulsive task, to attempt unravelling the merits of the quarrel, by which the lives of these two men were subsequently embittered and disgraced⁴. Like most other quar-

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 382.

² The Prince and Buckingham embarked secretly on the 17th of February, 1623. On the 21st of February, Laud wrote to Buckingham; and he received letters from him, out of Spain, on the 31st of March, the 9th of April, the 13th of June, and the 17th of August. On the 5th of October, the Prince and Buckingham landed at Portsmouth. These particulars are noted in the Diary, p. 6, 7.

³ Heylyn, p. 105. 113.

⁴ As to this matter, I am under the necessity of referring the reader, who may be curious in such inquiries, to the voluminous pages of Heylyn, and of Hacket. The investigation would, of itself, demand almost a volume.

rels, its beginnings were, probably, too obscure to enable even a living and impartial witness to fix upon the point at which either party placed himself decidedly in the wrong. It is manifest
 1623. from his Diary, that the matter weighed most heavily on the spirits of Laud. The first mention of it occurs on the 3rd of October, two days previously to the landing of the Prince and Buckingham: and this is followed by a frequent recurrence to the same subject. It appears that on several occasions this unhappy dissension haunted him in his dreams: and, on another, extorted from him complaints of "the envy and undeserved hate borne him by the Lord Keeper;" and drove him, for consolation, to prayer and meditation on the Scriptures. From a notice, dated somewhat later, we learn that Williams, at length, made his submission to the Duke; and avowed, that the cause of his alienation from his Grace, was the countenance and favour he had bestowed on Laud¹. It must be allowed that

¹ There are no less than eight passages in Laud's Diary, between the 3rd of October, 1622, and the 18th of February, 1623, inclusive, respecting his own or Buckingham's misunderstanding with Williams. Throughout, Laud speaks of himself as "more sinned against than sinning." But his entries throw scarcely any light on the origin or the particulars of the quarrel. See Diary, p. 7, 8, 10.

Nothing can well be more iniquitous or absurd than the inferences which have been sometimes drawn from the *dreams* recorded in the Diary of Laud. "I am certain," says Hacket, "it was for no goodwill that the Bishop of Lincoln was notched so often upon the tally of his ill-boding dreams. God did promise that *old men should dream dreams of holy revelation*. Acts ii. 17. But these came from the *old man which is corrupt*; Eph. iv. 22; who had *art and part* in all our Bishop's persecutions."

the whole affair has too much the aspect of a jealous competition between two courtiers, for the favour of a great man : and, even if we had all the particulars before us, it might be no easy matter to make an equitable adjustment of the blame between them. At the same time, justice demands that we should be very cautious in admitting that Laud was guilty of base ingratitude towards Williams. This charge has been frequently repeated : but the weight of it will be greatly reduced, if it be true, that Williams's anxiety for Laud's promotion to a Bishopric was mainly prompted by his own desire to retain the Deanery of Westminster. And we have already seen, that there is too much reason for ascribing his good offices principally to this motive.

Independently, however, of all premeditated aggression, on either part, it is manifestly impossible that Laud and Williams could have moved long in the same sphere, without constant danger of collision. Their characters, their views, their habits, were directly opposed to each other. Both, indeed, were fiery and impetuous. But, in all other respects, the difference between them was such as might be expected to grow almost into antipathy. Mutual approximation was altogether hopeless. It has been remarked, that Williams and Laud never seemed to know each other¹. The consequence was, that each of them was perpetually brooding over the supposed evil qualities of his antagonist. And in this temper,

Hacket, p. ii. p. 65.) At the present day, we have too much philosophy among us, if not too much charity, to attach the slightest importance to any such interpretation of the unruly caprices of the mind in sleep.

¹ Echard's History of England, vol. i. p. 420.

they carried on a contest discreditable to themselves, and infinitely mischievous to the public interest. The opposition of their notions respecting the religious dissensions of the time was, of itself, sufficient to cause their alienation. Laud was convinced, from the bottom of his soul, that there was no safety for the Empire or the Church, but in the suppression of the Puritanical faction; and, hence, he was stigmatized as an inveterate Papist. Williams, on the contrary, professed to believe that the Nonconformists might be rendered comparatively innocuous, by gentle and persuasive treatment¹; and, for this reason, he has been frequently condemned as the avowed patron of a dangerous and seditious party. Both imputations were, doubtless, much exaggerated; but their effect was to place each of these two individuals upon a different eminence, in the public eye; and thus to exasperate their mutual aversion.

Of that very remarkable personage, Bishop Williams, we may here, once for all, observe, that he seems to have been one of the most anomalous characters in history. He was, undoubtedly, a man of extraordinary powers, and vast attainments. It is, moreover, unquestionable, that he was of a capacious and munificent heart, utterly unable to confine itself to a low and narrow sphere of action. His preferments were enormous. But it does not appear that he was prompted to seek them by a sordid love of gain: for his revenues were consumed by him in splendid hospitality, in a generous encouragement of learning, and in the charitable relief of indigence. That his sense of religion was deep, may fairly be concluded from his

¹ Hacket, pt. ii. p. 39—43.

expressions to a divine who came to him for institution: "I have passed," he said, "through many places of honour and trust, both in Church and State; more than any of my order in England, these seventy years before. But, were I but assured that by my preaching I had converted one soul unto God, I should take therein more joy and comfort, than in all the honours and offices which have been bestowed upon me." Of his faithfulness and loyalty, we may judge by the fact, recorded by his biographer,—that, after the murder of the King, he passed his time in sorrowful and devout retirement; and that, thenceforth, it was his constant practice to rise at midnight, and to pray for a quarter of an hour on his bare knees, without any covering but his night-dress and waistcoat. Nevertheless, connected with his great and admirable qualities, there was, evidently, a worldly spirit of intrigue¹; a sleepless and insatiable ambition; a lust of advancement and power, which is always of most pernicious example in the person of a churchman. And to these (if Clarendon may be credited) we must add, a genius for lying, so active and inexhaustible, that a mere prosaic adherence to truth must have been positively wearisome to him². Now, this peculiarity may, at least, help

¹ The intriguing and worldly spirit of Williams is manifest, from the whole tenor of his history. The reader, who may wish for some particular exemplifications of it, may find them in Hacket, pt. i. p. 25. 29, 30. 41. 44. 62. 190. 197—201. Pt. ii. p. 25. 160. &c. &c.

² One astounding exhibition of the *inventive* faculty, which Clarendon ascribes to Williams, must be familiar to the readers of the History of the Rebellion. It is much too long for insertion here. But it may be found in vol. ii. p. 105—109. ed. 1826. In spite of the grave and circumstantial manner of the narrative, one

to guide us to a tolerably safe opinion, relative to the merits of his protracted strife with Laud. Whatever were the failings of the latter, duplicity, most certainly, was not of the number. It appears that even his persecutors were compelled to bear witness to his uncompromising plainness, and inflexible consistency. Williams, on the contrary, if not shamefully misrepresented, must have been habitually, and almost constitutionally, a dealer in fiction. And who would ever look for a scrupulous adversary in one, by whom facts were not regarded as sacred things? And how formidable must have been the enmity of a man, who was under the dominion of an aspiring temper, but free from the restraints of strict and lofty principle!

1624. On the 19th of February, 1624, the Parliament assembled: the Convocation on the 20th. The Parliament met his Majesty with Petitions, first, for the dissolution of the Spanish treaty; secondly, for a war with Spain; and thirdly, for a general fast. The king complied; and was rewarded by his faithful Commons, with "the greatest aid that was ever granted in Parliament, to be levied in so short a time;" the 16th of March, 1625, being the period limited for the payment. On the 23rd of March, the rupture with *Popish* Spain was celebrated with bells and bonfires. On the 24th of November,

can hardly suppress a rising of incredulity against it. And yet, we find that Warburton, who is disposed to be rather the apologist of Williams, is unable to withhold his credence from it. His words are, "I suppose the noble historian speaks this of his own knowledge, as being one of the council at the meeting. The confidence with which he tells the whole story shows it." Warburton's Note to Clar. vol. vii. p. 546. ed. 1826.

the contract of alliance with *Popish* France was honoured with similar solemnities ! In the mean time, the Clergy were more confiding towards their Sovereign, than the Commons of England. The Convocation granted him four entire subsidies, being at the rate of four shillings in every pound ; and this without condition or limitation. Unfortunately, however, their liberality threatened to fall with a ruinous weight, upon numbers of the poorer clergy ; who on this occasion, found a sympathising and active friend in Laud. He had himself been at one time the Vicar of Stamford, in Northamptonshire, and his experience taught him how disastrous the levy must be to his more indigent brethren, if it should be rigorously enforced. He accordingly submitted their case to the consideration of Buckingham ; and succeeded in obtaining from him a promise of intercession with the Crown, for some indulgence in the periods of payment. He then communicated the favourable result of his application to the Lord Keeper Williams, and to the Bishop of Durham. Williams encouraged him with warm expressions of approbation : and said that it was the best office which had been done for the Church, for the last seven years : and they both joined in recommending that he should immediately acquaint the Archbishop of Canterbury with the step he had taken. To his severe mortification, he was repelled by Abbot, with asperity, and even with insolence. The account of the interview will be best given in his own words :—
“ His Grace was very angry, asked what I had to do to make any suit for the Church ; told me, never any Bishop had attempted the like, at any time, nor would any but myself have done it ; that I had given the

Church such a wound, in speaking to any Lord of the Laity about it, as I could never make whole again; that if my Lord Duke did fully understand what I had done, he would never endure me to come near him again. I answered: I thought I had done a very good office for the Church; and so did my betters think. If his Grace thought otherwise, I was sorry that I had offended him. And I hoped, (being done out of a good mind, for the support of many poor Vicars, abroad in the country, who must needs sink under three subsidies in a year,) my error, if it were one, was pardonable. So we parted. I went to my Lord Duke, and acquainted him with it; lest I might have ill offices done me for it, to the King and the Prince. So may God bless me, his servant, labouring under the pressure of them, who always wished ill to me!¹ It is difficult to perceive what there was in the proposal of Laud, which could excite so much vehement opposition from the Head of the Clerical Body. It was, indeed, most unfortunate for the inferior Clergy, that he, who should have been their protector, had never known the hard condition of a poor incumbent. He had been advanced to the Primacy without passing through the duties or the trials of any one parochial cure: and was, therefore, but ill prepared to enter cordially into the sufferings of the humbler labourers. Besides, there seems too much reason to suspect that his dislike of the *measure* was considerably strengthened by his antipathy to the *man*.

The settled aversion of Abbot for the Bishop, was probably made keener by the confidence with which he continued to be distinguished by Buckingham.

¹ Diary, March 29, 1624. p. 11, 12.

Such was the intimacy between them, that, during a serious illness which fell upon the Duke this year, in the month of May, Laud was in frequent attendance upon him as his Chaplain. On several occasions he watched by the bed-side of his patron, and contributed, by his friendly offices, to mitigate the impatience of the sufferer, under the pains of his disorder¹. But, whatever might be Laud's attachment to Buckingham, it soon became manifest that it had not broken down his independent spirit: for it was about this time, that the funds of the Charter House were rescued from spoliation by his uncourtly firmness and integrity. The design of appropriating the revenues of this House to the support of the army, was opened to Laud by the Duke, on the 25th of September². But in vain was it urged by the minister, that this application would both ease the subject, and aid the urgent necessities of the King. The Bishop resolutely opposed the scheme, at the hazard of the favourite's resentment, and the monarch's serious displeasure. And by his faithful and intrepid bearing, he preserved for ever, to the cause of charity and literature, a noble establishment, the confiscation of which would have afforded no permanent or substantial relief to the exigencies of the Crown³.

Towards the latter end of this year, 1624, the learning and talents of Laud were again put in requisition. On the 23rd of December, he delivered to the Duke of Buckingham a little tract, on the subject of *doctrinal Puritanism*; a treatise which he had compiled at the request of the Duke, who was anxious

¹ Diary, p. 12. Heylyn, p. 123. ² Diary, p. 12.

³ Heylyn, p. 123.

to be in possession of some distinct notions relative to the Theological Disputes which were then distracting, not England alone, but nearly the whole of Protestant Europe¹. To what extent his illustrious pupil profited by his instructions, it would be idle to conjecture; as a premature death cut off all his projects, whether of theological study, or political enterprise.

In the midst of all this ecclesiastical strife
1625. and civil agitation, King James departed this life. He expired at Theobalds, on the 27th of March, 1625: leaving the high prerogatives of the Crown in mortal jeopardy, and “the Church beleaguered by two great enemies; assaulted openly by the Papist, on the one side, and undermined by the Puritan, on the other².” On the same day, Prince Charles was solemnly proclaimed King. It is scarcely possible to think, without an aching heart, upon the secret prayer of Laud, on his Majesty’s accession, “God grant to him a prosperous and happy reign³.”

¹ Diary, p. 14. Heylyn, p. 124.

² Ib. p. 128, 129.

³ Diary, p. 15.

CHAPTER III.

A.D. 1625—1627.

Charles's first Parliament—Censure of Montague's Book by the Commons—Williams declines, and Laud rises, in the royal favour—Laud assists at the Coronation—He is charged with placing a crucifix on the Altar, and of altering the Coronation Oath—These charges examined—He preaches at the opening of the second parliament—Committee of Religion—Further proceedings against Montague—Proclamation of 1626 against novelties in doctrine and discipline—Second Parliament dissolved—Dr. Goodman, Bishop of Gloucester, suspected of Popery—Laud exposed to blame for aiding Buckingham in his defence against his impeachment—Also, for drawing up Speeches for the King—Laud is translated to the See of Bath and Wells—Draws up the royal instructions, for a supply—His conduct and principles considered—He is made Dean of the Chapel Royal—Sermons of Sibthorpe and Manwaring—Sequestration of Archbishop Abbot.

THE first Parliament of Charles assembled on the 18th of June, 1625 : and Laud was commanded to preach, on this occasion, before his Majesty and the House of Peers. It is manifest, from his Sermon, that he looked with a far-sighted, and almost with a prophetic eye, upon the designs of that revolutionary faction, whose rancorous enmity he earned by his devoted attachment to the Church and to the throne. "They," he said, "whoever they be, that would overturn the *Sedes Ecclesiæ*, the seats of ecclesiastical judgment, will not spare, if ever they get the power, to have a pluck at the

throne of David. And there is not a man that is for *parity*,—all fellows in this Church,—but he is against Monarchy in the State. And, certainly, he is half-headed to his own principles, or he can be but half-hearted to the throne of David¹." But, notwithstanding the preacher's open denunciation of the destructive party, for a short time all was serenity and sunshine. At length, however, the Commons responded to his Majesty's exposition of his wants, by a parsimonious supply, and an ample catalogue of grievances. They, then, proceeded to exercise the office, with which they had recently invested themselves, of Theological Inquisitors. The first person who experienced their rigour, was a Divine named Montague. He had distinguished himself, in the preceding reign, by a volume against Popery. His services, however, found but little grace in the eyes of the Calvinistic Legislators; for his own book was tainted with what they were pleased to stigmatise as the Arminian *heresy*; a perversion of the Gospel almost as hateful, in their estimation, as Popery itself! He, nevertheless, aggravated his offence, by a vindication of his odious doctrines, under the title of *Appello Cæsarem*; and this work he dedicated to the King. Upon this, the wrath of the Parliamentary Synod was extreme. On the 7th of July, they summoned him to their bar; and there, by the mouth of their Speaker, they declared it to be their pleasure, first, that their final sentence on his heretical opinions should be deferred to the next Session; secondly, that during the interval, he should be committed to the custody of the Serjeant-at-arms; and, thirdly,

¹ Laud's Sermons, on Ps. cxxii.

that he should find bail for his appearance, to the value of two thousand pounds¹!

As the act of an assembly which was fighting the battle of freedom against prerogative, this measure was sufficiently astounding. Well might Laud exclaim, "Methinks I see a cloud arising and threatening the Church of England. God, of his mercy, dissipate it²!" The King was, beyond measure, indignant at this flagitious oppression of one of his own Chaplains; and signified his displeasure to the House. It appears, however, from a letter addressed by Montague to the Duke of Buckingham, on the 29th of July, that the royal interference was but partially effectual. He complains that the Commons had returned no other answer to his Majesty, but that he was free from imprisonment. And he beseeches the Duke to stand his friend so far as to represent his case to the King, in order to his absolute discharge, and to the re-delivery of his bond, which had been extorted from him by the Commons³.

It was not to be supposed that Laud would be a passive spectator of this abuse of Parliamentary power. After consultation with several of his brethren, he joined the Bishops of Rochester and Oxford in framing a letter to the Duke of Buckingham, on Montague's behalf. In this address, the writers declare that some of Montague's opinions were neither more nor less than the settled doctrine of the Church, which every minister of the Church was bound to maintain; that the rest were fit only to be debated in the schools; and that it was utterly

¹ Heylyn, p. 153.

² Diary, p. 27.

³ This Letter is in the Harl. MSS. 7000, No. 106.

abhorrent from the moderation of the Reformed Church of England, that any man should be brought into jeopardy for a peaceable expression of his own sense, upon matters of an abstruse and doubtful nature. They further protest against the jurisdiction of a merely secular tribunal, in the determination of questions purely theological. They advert, in the strongest terms, to the manifold evils threatened both to Church and State, by those *fatal opinions* which Montague opposed. And, lastly, they insist on the danger and the indignity of receiving the decrees of a foreign Synod¹; more especially of a Synod which condemned the discipline and government of the Anglican Church. The letter concludes with expressions of satisfaction at the intelligence, that "his Majesty had worthily referred the business, in a right course, to *Church consideration*;" and with commendations of Montague, as a person "able, every way, to do great service to God, his Majesty, and the Church of England²." The date of the above letter is the 2nd day of August, 1625. In ten day safter this, the Parliament was dissolved³. The King immediately commenced a progress to the West, for the purpose of inspecting and hastening the preparations of his navy. And Laud, at the same time, set out for Wales, on his second visitation of the Diocese of St. David's.

¹ The Calvinistic Synod of Dort.

² The whole of this letter is given at length by Heylyn, p. 136—138.

³ "August 12, Friday, the Parliament was dissolved; the Commons not hearkening as was expected to the King's proposals." Diary, p. 21.

On his return to London, in the middle of the winter, he found that a considerable change had occurred at the court, during his absence. The Duke of Buckingham was one who never forgave an enemy, or forgot a friend. Among his enemies, he was now pleased to number the Lord Keeper Williams. It was beyond his power, however, to degrade the Bishop from his ecclesiastical dignities and preferments. But his influence was amply sufficient to deprive him of the King's esteem, and, eventually, to wrest from him the Great Seal of England. The decline of Williams was speedily followed by the elevation of Laud. By the earnest recommendation of his friend, Neile, the Bishop of Durham, who was then disabled by sickness, he was appointed to attend his Majesty, as Clerk of the Closet. And, from that time, he advanced so rapidly in the royal favour, that he became the King's confidential adviser in all important matters relating to the Church.

It was about this time that Laud, in common with the other Bishops, was called upon to enforce the existing laws for the preservation of the Protestant Religion. In the late Parliament petitions had been presented to the King, both by the Lords and the Commons, in which they complained of the dangerous growth of Popery in the realm; and, in reply, his Majesty had promised a speedy attention to their representations. In fulfilment of this promise, a commission, under the great seal, was issued in December, 1625, for the execution of the laws against recusants; and letters were dispatched to the two Archbishops, requiring them to use all diligence in the discovery and conviction of Jesuits, and Semi-

nary Priests, and other seducers of the people. Instructions were issued, accordingly, by Laud, to the Ecclesiastical Officers of his Diocese, directed against those "who were any way backward in points of religion; and, more especially, to known and professed recusants." And a list was speedily transmitted to him by his Chancellor, containing the names of such persons of that description as were living in the counties of Pembroke and Caermarthen, which formed the chief portion of the Diocese of St. David's¹.

The coronation of King Charles was now approaching. And, on this occasion, Laud was again distinguished by the favour of his Sovereign. He was named by his Majesty one of a committee of Bishops, appointed to consult respecting the various ceremonies of that great solemnity: and he was further selected to supply the place of Bishop Williams, who was then Dean of Westminster, but (being under the King's displeasure) was commanded to forbear his attendance at the coronation². And here it may be observed that the conduct of Williams,

¹ Heylyn seems to consider it as unquestionable, that the King's letter was framed with an express view to Puritans, as well as Romanists, p. 140, 141. But there appears no sufficient ground for this surmise.

² From a letter of Williams, to Buckingham, dated Jan. 7, 1626, it appears that he offered his services at the coronation; and this, with almost abject entreaties to the Duke, for his favour and protection. For instance, "I do humbly beseech your Grace to crown so many of your Grace's former favours, and to revive a creature of your own, *struck dead only by your displeasure*, by bringing me to kiss his Majesty's hand; with whom I took leave in no displeasure at all. I never was brought into the presence of a King by any *saint* besides yourself. *Turn me*

in this emergency, was marked by singular discretion and address. Though forbidden to appear himself, he still might have nominated one among his Prebendaries to represent him. Of these dignitaries, Laud was one; and, moreover, he was the only Bishop among them. Had Williams, therefore, fixed upon a member of the chapter, inferior in rank, his conduct would have been open to misconstruction and blame. To nominate Laud, on the other hand, would be to confer a signal honour upon one whom he regarded as an adversary and a rival. He relieved himself from this embarrassment, by sending to the King the names of all the Prebendaries of the Church, with their respective degrees and dignities affixed to each; leaving to his Majesty the choice of the fittest person of the number. And, without a moment's hesitation, his Majesty deputed Laud to the service¹.

It was the business of Laud, in execution of the duty which, on such occasions, belonged to the office of the Dean, to inspect and to produce the regalia, which are always laid up in a secret place in the Abbey Church, and to receive them back into his custody, on the conclusion of the ceremonial. Now we are told by his biographer, that, among these venerable trappings of royalty, he found an ancient

not over, most noble Lord, to offer my prayers at any other altars!" &c. &c. &c. Harl. MSS. 7000, No. 102.

After he was forbidden to attend, he wrote to the King, to beg, first, that his Majesty would allay the Duke's displeasure against him: secondly, that his Majesty would not believe the accusations with which he (Williams) was assailed: and, thirdly, that his absence from Parliament might not be made use of, to wound the reputation of *a poor Bishop!* The letter is without a date. Harl. MSS. 7000, No. 107.

¹ Heylyn, p. 144.

crucifix of silver; that he brought it out, together with the rest; and that (conceiving it to form a customary part of the apparatus of the coronation) he placed it on the altar. It is well known that the appearance of this crucifix (if crucifix there actually were) was afterwards brought forward, among many other proofs of the *Romish* propensities of Laud. At this day, however, it is pretty generally allowed that the charge was altogether frivolous and contemptible; and such as almost carried its own refutation on the face of it. In the first place, it must be recollected, that the office of Laud, on this occasion, was purely ministerial; that he was acting merely as the substitute and representative of another person; and that he could have no authority whatever to conceal, or to withhold, any one article which he might find among the coronation implements. It should also be kept in mind that Abbot, as Primate, must have presided over the ceremonial, and all the preparations for it; and that if *he* did not think it necessary to object to the crucifix, it must have been deemed insufferably presumptuous in Laud to quarrel with it. But, lastly, it is, after all, more than doubtful whether any crucifix was actually produced. It is scarcely credible that Abbot, of all men in the realm, would have endured, for a moment, the exhibition of the *idolatrous symbol*. This was the answer given by Laud himself, when the charge was brought forward against him, at his impeachment. And this answer was accompanied with a positive declaration, that he had no recollection whatever of the circumstance in question ¹.

¹ See Heylyn, p. 144. Diary, p. 26. 27. 28.—Troubles and Trial, p. 318.

But a much graver charge than the exhibition of a crucifix, was the consequence of Laud's employment in this celebration. He was afterwards confidently accused of introducing an alteration into the body of the King's coronation oath; and such an alteration, too, as tended materially to weaken the security of the subject. And it was said, at the time of his impeachment, that, if the imputation were made good, this single delinquency might justly be deemed sufficient to forfeit his life. Such, indeed, was the tragic emphasis with which the Article was then insisted upon, that it set the whole kingdom in a flame. It is therefore proper, at this period of the narrative, to show, by a simple statement of the facts, that the charge was utterly destitute of foundation.

The first clause of the oath, as administered to Charles I., was in the following words: "Will you grant and keep, and by your oath confirm, to your people of England, the laws and customs to them granted by the Kings of England, your lawful and religious predecessors; and, namely, the laws, customs, and franchises, granted to the clergy, by the glorious King, St. Edward, your predecessor, according to the laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel established in this kingdom, *and agreeably to the prerogatives of the Kings thereof*, and the ancient customs of the land?" Now, one accusation against Laud was, that he had presumed to alter the oath, as usually administered, by the insertion of the words above printed in Italics. And this alteration, as he himself tells us, was "highly insisted on, *as taking off the total assurance which the subjects have, by the oath of their prince, for the performance of his laws.*" It was further alleged that, as in this instance he

had sinned by adding to the words of the oath, so, in another instance, he had offended by taking away from them; inasmuch as he had cancelled the words *quæ populus elegerit* from that clause of the oath which relates to the royal assent to laws proposed by the other branches of the Legislature. This latter accusation, however, was much less "highly insisted on" than the former. In spite of all their ingenuity and perseverance, his enemies found it to be utterly untenable.

In fact, both these charges were equally despicable and false. For, in the first place, the oath, whether altered or not, was administered to the King, not by Laud, but by Abbot, then Archbishop of Canterbury. And it is utterly impossible than any alteration could have been introduced, without the privity and consent of the Archbishop, and of the other Prelates, who were more especially entrusted with the management of the solemnity. If, then, there had been any foul practice in the matter, Laud must have been only one of a body of conspirators against the liberty of the subject, with the Primate at their head. But, in the next place, it is absolutely certain that no alteration whatever was effected or attempted. For it appears that, after much urgent application, Laud at length succeeded in getting the form of King Charles's coronation compared with that of his father and predecessor, King James, "*and they were found to agree in all things, to a syllable.*"

With regard to the odious words, "*agreeably to the prerogative of the Kings thereof,*" it does not seem to be clearly ascertained at what period they were first introduced into the coronation oath. It is, however, conjectured by Laud himself, and with

much appearance of probability, that they were added in the time, either of Edward VI., or of Queen Elizabeth; and that they have no reference whatever to the laws and customs, conceded by the Kings of England to the people, as *generally* and absolutely mentioned in the beginning of the oath: but that they are to be referred, *specifically*, to the franchises anciently granted to the Clergy; the mention of which immediately precedes those words. It will easily be perceived that, at the period of the Reformation, such an addition to the oath would be highly expedient, for the purpose of arming the prerogative of the King, not against the rights and liberties of his people, but against the incroachments of the Church, and the power and jurisdiction of the Papacy. And, as Laud very justly observes, if this were the purpose for which the words were inserted, "he that made the alteration, whoever it were, deserves thanks for it, and not the reward of a traitor¹!"

On Monday, the 6th of February, 1626, the King met his second Parliament: on which occasion Laud was appointed to preach before his Majesty, in the Abbey Church. The text selected by him was from Psalm cxii. *Jerusalem is like a city that is at unity with itself.*—The object of the preacher was, to set forth the blessedness of unity: and with this view, he dwelled upon the glories of Jerusalem, as a type of the Christian Church and State combined. By way

¹ They who are desirous of seeing the emptiness and the malice of this accusation completely exposed, must consult Laud's full and irresistible reply to it, in his *Troubles and Trial*, p. 318—324.

of a passing illustration, this might have been unexceptionable enough. But, in these days, there was obvious danger in much pointed and emphatic reference to Jewish history. A Bishop might appeal to it, in support of his argument for unity and concord. And a Puritanical Lecturer might appeal to it, for the purpose of showing that the *people of God* must be *zealous, even to slaying*, whenever the *enemies of God* are to be smitten down. It was, in truth, a sword with a double edge; and Laud must have known the fury with which the Calvinistic faction had already wielded it; more especially in the northern dominions of the King. But let the skill and capacity of the preacher be what they might, his principles were such as many of his audience had no ears to hear, or hearts to understand. The tongue of men or angels might, then, have preached in vain, on the blessings of union, or the mischiefs of discord. A conflict between two great principles had then commenced; and the mighty cause was coming on gradually to its arbitrament. And accordingly, when the minister of God spake of peace, the men of that generation made them ready for battle.

In one respect, indeed, the Commons appeared to be any thing but averse from the doctrine of ecclesiastical and political *union*. For, after this time, there was no Parliament without a Committee of Religion, and no Committee of Religion which did not think itself sufficiently instructed to manage the greatest controversies of Divinity¹. And, we may add, that there

¹ There is something lively and amusing enough in the following remarks of Heylyn, on the usurpation of the Theological Chair by the wisdom of the honourable House: "At such

was no decision of theirs, in such controversial matters, which they were not prepared to enforce by the secular arm of Parliamentary privilege and power. In conformity with these notions of *unity*, the Commons resumed their proceedings against Montague. They referred his books to the consideration of their Committee of Religion. The report of that Committee was brought up by Pym, on the 18th of April. And thereupon, it was resolved, 1st, that Montague had disturbed the peace of the Church, by publishing doctrines contrary to the articles of the Church of England, and the Book of Homilies: 2nd, that there were divers passages in his book, especially against those whom he called *Puritans*, apt to move sedition between the King and his subjects, and between subject and subject; and 3dly, that the whole frame and scope of his book was to discourage the well-affected in religion, from the true religion established in the Church, and to incline them, and (as much as in him lay) to reconcile them to *Popery*. Before this time, the works of Montague had been assailed by various adversaries; and, among them, by several dignitaries of the Church. But the sound of this thunderbolt now roused up against him another host of enemies, so numerous, that "the

time as the former parliament was adjourned to Oxon, the Divinity School was prepared for the House of Commons, and a chair made for the Speaker in or near the place in which his Majesty's Professor of Divinity did usually read his public Lectures, and moderate in all public disputations. And this first put them into conceit, that the determination of all points and controversies in religion did belong to them, as *Vibius Rufus*, in the story, having married *Tully's* widow, and bought *Cæsar's* chair, conceived that he was then in a way to gain the eloquence of the one, and the power of the other." Heylyn, p. 146.

encounter seemed to be betwixt a whole army and a single person ¹." Hereupon, Laud, and some others of his brethren, attempted to come in to the rescue : and they conceived themselves sufficiently armed for the adventure by a recent Proclamation of the King. There can be little doubt that this edict had been issued by the express advice of Laud himself, and certain other Bishops, to whose further consideration the case of Montague had been referred. For we find that on the 16th of January, 1626, a letter, dated from Winchester-house, had been addressed to the Duke by the Bishops of London, Durham, Winchester, Rochester, and St. David's ; in which, after repeating the opinion formerly given, that Montague had affirmed nothing but the doctrine of the Church of England, the writers proceed as follows : " And for the preservation of the peace of the Church, we, in all humility, conceive that his Majesty shall do graciously, to prohibit all parties, members of this Church of England, any further controverting those questions by public preaching or writing, or any other way, to the disturbance of the peace of the Church, for the time to come. And, for any thing that may further concern Mr. Montague's person in that business, we humbly recommend him to his Majesty's gracious favour and pardon ²." It was not, however, till June 1626, that a Proclamation was put forth, in conformity with the spirit of these vigorous counsels. In that document, his Majesty declares it to be his constant resolution, to endure no innovation, either in the doctrine and

¹ Heylyn, p. 155. Robert Bayley's " Examination," &c. 4to. 1643.

² This Letter is in the Harl. MSS. 7000, No. 104.

discipline of the Church, or in the government of the State. He commands all his subjects, the clergy more especially, to abstain from the publication of any new inventions or opinions concerning religion. And he strictly charges the Bishops, the Privy Counsellors, the Judges, and all the ministers of justice, to repress those daring spirits, who should, thereafter, transgress against sobriety and peace. He, moreover, intimates his royal pleasure, that all such evil doers shall be visited with the severity which their offences and contempts should be found to deserve ¹.

By virtue of this Proclamation, proceedings were instituted for the suppression of the writings against Montague. Among various other authors, Burton and Prynne, of notorious memory, were summoned before the court of High Commission. But, in the very moment when the censures of that tribunal were about to fall upon the delinquents, the blow was intercepted by a Prohibition from the King's Bench. And with such rudeness was this writ executed, that Laud was on the point to take such steps as should cause the officials to repent their insolence. The conflict, therefore, was beginning to wax hot. By this time, however, the Parliament had ceased to exist. Their dissolution had taken place on the 15th of June, 1626. For some time before this, the wrath of the Commons had been diverted, by nobler game, from the pursuit of an Arminian divine. Their theological functions had been interrupted by their impatience to effect the ruin of Buckingham. And the King's resolution to protect his favourite minister

¹ Heylyn, p. 154.

abruptly put an end to their political functions also. But for these occurrences, it might, probably, have gone hard with Montague, and even with his ecclesiastical friends and champions.

While these transactions were pending, the services of Laud were required, in assisting to dispose of another controversial matter. On the fifth Sunday of Lent, a sermon had been preached before the King, by Dr. Gabriel Goodman, then Bishop of Gloucester; in which the doctrine of the *real presence* was so closely urged, that the preacher was thought to be hard upon the confines of Popery! The matter occasioned some murmurings at the Court; and these were followed by an angry clamour in the country. On the 29th of March, the doubtful theology of Goodman was the subject of a warm debate in the Convocation. And, on the 12th of April following, the sermon, by his Majesty's command, was taken into consideration by three of the Prelates, of whom Laud was one; the other two being Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Andrews, Bishop of Winchester. It would appear, by the result, that the outcry was vastly disproportioned to the occasion. The Report of the three Bishops to his Majesty was, that some things in the discourse had been rather incautiously expressed, but nothing falsely; that nothing was innovated by the preacher in the doctrine of the Church of England; but that it would be adviseable, for the satisfaction of the public, that Goodman should deliver the same sermon again, at sometime to be chosen by himself; and should then point out in what particulars he had been mistaken by his auditors. With these suggestions the Bishop complied. And if the course

adopted was satisfactory to Abbot, it may reasonably be concluded that, whatever may have been Goodman's secret persuasion, the *Protestant* doctrine of the Sacrament had been but little endangered by his public exposition of it¹. Happy, indeed, would it have been for the kingdom, if all the theological disputes of the day could have been brought to as peaceful a decision. What might have been the consequence, if the Convocation had, likewise, embroiled itself with the interminable questions which had been stirred by the publications of Montague, and his antagonists, it is difficult to say. In that case, the spirit which had presided at Dort, might possibly have been let loose again at Westminster. But, thanks to the pacific counsels of Bishop Andrews, this additional infusion of discord was happily prevented.

It would be wholly foreign to our purpose, to relate the stormy proceedings of the Commons against the Duke of Buckingham, during the late short session; or to dwell on the fatal alienation between the King and the Parliament, which grew up out of that disastrous struggle. Some allusion to them, however, is unavoidable, in a history of Laud; for he, in the public opinion, was all but identified with his noble patron. His constant intimacy with the Duke was, of itself, sufficient to satisfy the enemies of both, that the Bishop was, throughout, the adviser and the champion of the man, to whom the Commons afterwards ascribed all the evils and distractions with which the kingdom was afflicted². And so fully had

¹ Heylyn, p. 153. Diary, p. 30, 31.

² Diary, p. 42.

this persuasion fixed itself in the minds of many, that the aid which he is supposed to have given to the Minister, when he fell under the displeasure of the Parliament, was afterwards produced against the Bishop, at his trial, in 1644, and was placed in front of the evidence, upon the 14th Article of his impeachment. By that Article, he was accused of having laboured to subvert the rights of Parliament, to set a division between the King and his people, and to ruin and destroy his Majesty's kingdom. In support of these charges, it was affirmed, that "being then of the Lords' House, and so to be one of the Duke's judges, he made a speech for him; and that he had corrected another speech of his, in some particulars; and that, of a Judge, he had made himself an Advocate." The speech which Laud is alleged to have corrected, was that which was delivered by Buckingham, in answer to his impeachment by the Commons. The one which he is supposed to have penned, was that which the Duke subjoined as a supplement to his answer¹. From the Bishop's reply to this charge, it does not appear that he was at all anxious to deny the fact, of his having rendered some such assistance to the Duke on that occasion; though not having the papers themselves then in his possession, he was unable to say, "what was, or what was not, under his own hand. It was," he says, "but the office of a poor friend to a great one; to whom, being so much bound as I was, I could not refuse so much service, being entreated to it:" and he expressed himself persuaded, that what he had done for Buckingham, was no more than what any member of either

¹ Heylyn, p. 152.

house would do without scruple, for a friend, upon any similar emergency. But, at all events, "the making of one speech, and the mending of another," whether strictly proper or not, under such circumstances, was but poor evidence of a traitorous design against the Majesty of Parliament. If it could be shown that there was treasonable matter in these compositions, the writer, as Laud allows, might be bound to answer it. As it was, he could plead guilty to nothing but compliance with the urgent request of a benefactor, who stood in need of his assistance¹.

But a further attempt was made to substantiate this charge, by the production of the following entry, from the Diary of Laud:—"June 15, 1626. After many debates and strugglings, *private malice* against the Duke of Buckingham prevailed, and stopped all public business. Nothing was done, and the Parliament was dissolved." Here, it was contended, was a manifest imputation of *private malice* to the Parliament of England! That much *private malice* did actually mix itself up with the patriotism of certain honourable members, at that time, is a thing no more to be questioned, than the manifold demerits of the minister on whom they sat in judgment. Neither can it be doubted, that *private malice* was quite as busy without the walls of the House of Commons, as within them. And this, as Laud, in effect, declares, was all that he had in contemplation, when he wrote the words. "I spake this," he says, "not of the Parliament (collectively), but of some few particular men: *some* of the House; and *more* not of the House, who went between, and did very ill offices,

¹ Troubles and Trial, p. 400.

and so, wronged both the King and Parliament; which is no new thing in England." Besides, as Laud further observes, the expression, *private malice*, is scarcely intelligible, as applied to a *public* body, in their collective capacity¹. And, lastly, we may add, whether the malice imputed were private or public, there can be but one opinion respecting the iniquity of branding any one as a traitor, for a written *soliloquy* upon the conduct or the motives of public men.

A still more formidable proof of Laud's hostility to Parliament, was discovered in two speeches delivered by the King: the one on the 29th of March, to both the Houses of Parliament; the other to the House of Peers, on the 11th of May. Each of these speeches had reference to the Duke of Buckingham; and the latter of them complained that the honour of the nobility was assailed by the malicious calumnies of the members of the House, by whom the Duke had been accused². "*Sour and ill passages*" were to be found in both: and for these, Laud was called upon to answer, as being their notorious and undoubted author. He frankly admitted that the speeches in question *were* drawn up by him. But he added, that they were so drawn up in obedience to the commands of the King; and also with such faithful adherence to his instructions, that the very words and phrases of his Majesty were preserved as closely as his memory would allow. He hoped it was no crime to be trusted by his Sovereign. And, as for the *tartness* of certain passages or expressions, he declared himself heartily concerned, if they had given

¹ Troubles and Trial, p. 403, 404.

² Diary, p. 30. 33.

offence ; but he protested against their production as a proof of his traitorous enmity to Parliaments ¹.

It has been thought that the line of defence, here adopted by Laud, was much too frequently resorted to by him, in the course of his trial, when he was charged with practices supposed to be adverse to the rights and liberties of his country. This sort of vindication is, indeed, utterly unknown to the present constitution of England. In these times, the maxim, that "the King can do no wrong," throws the whole weight of responsibility upon the ministers of the King. But, in the age of Laud, the same maxim was, on the contrary, often considered as extending to the ministers and advisers of the Crown, something of the same immunity which belonged to the Sovereign himself. And, hence, we find the Bishop occasionally retiring, for protection, behind the shield of the royal authority and power. To us, such a spectacle may seem to indicate a want of magnanimity, and moral courage. This, however, is a defect, which the whole course of his life shows to have been altogether foreign to the nature of Laud. It may, therefore, be reasonably concluded, that in pleading the orders of his Majesty, he believed this mode of defence to be perfectly legitimate and constitutional.

Laud had now presided for five years over the Diocese of St. David's ². On the 4th of May, 1626, the see of Bath and Wells became vacant by the death of Dr. Lake. On the 20th of June, Laud was nominated by the King to the vacant Bishop-

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 402, 403.

² On the 16th of March, 1626, we find, in Laud's Diary, notice of a strange plan, proposed by an old Dutchman, named John Oventrout, for transferring the West Indies from the dominion

ric. On the same day, he was commanded to prepare a sermon for the public fast which had been appointed by proclamation for the 5th of July following : partly on account of the pestilence which then was raging in many parts of the kingdom ; and partly on account of the dangers with which the country was menaced by her foreign enemies ¹. On the 16th of August, the Bishop was elected to the See of Bath and Wells. It might have been well for his peace, if he had instantly betaken himself to the care of his diocese, and had withdrawn, for the rest of his days, from the snares and the perils of political life. But, by this time, his services had become indispensable both to

of Spain to that of the King of England. This notable enterprise was referred to the consideration of the Earl of Totness, and of Lord Conway, then principal Secretary of State. And, because the success of the stratagem was, somehow or other, to depend upon *religion*, Laud was added to the Commission. When they came to examine the man, they found, no doubt to their great astonishment, that the *Catechism of Heidelberg* was the wonder-working instrument by which the revolution was to be accomplished ! The main thing to be achieved, was the capture of a place called Arica. And in order to effect this, nothing more would be needed, than to toss in, among the inhabitants, the potent formulary in question. The minds of the people would thus be divided in matters of religion ; and the place would, consequently, become an easy prey to an enterprising Protestant invader ! It will readily be imagined that neither the Statesmen, nor the Divine, were much disposed to put their trust in this sort of spiritual bombardment. The projector must have been some half-lunatic enthusiast ; who, possibly, thought that if the blast of the rams' horns could prostrate the walls of heathen Jericho, the Popish dominion of the West must certainly fall at the sound of *Heidelberg* Divinity. The commissioners, of course, sent the man away, to search for hearers of greater faith. " We dismissed him," says Laud, " and returned, never a wit the wiser !" ¹ Diary, p. 34.

the Sovereign and his Minister. The situation of the King, at that period, was embarrassing, to a degree which can scarcely be imagined by persons accustomed only to the regular movements of our present Constitution. The country was involved in a formidable war, chiefly at the instigation of the House of Commons. But, when the sinews of war were required of them, they replied by an exposition of grievances, and by a demand for the ruin of the Duke of Buckingham. Some inadequate supply, indeed, was granted. But before the grant had passed into a law, the Parliament was, unhappily, dissolved, by the impatience of the king. Under these circumstances, one of two courses was open to him. Either he must discontinue all warlike preparation, and so expose the kingdom to danger and insult, and himself to irretrievable dishonour: or, else, he must levy money by irregular and arbitrary measures. He chose the latter, as the less evil of the two. And the Bishop of Bath and Wells was called upon to aid him in the execution of the design. It was on Thursday evening, the 14th September, that Laud was commanded to draw up "certain instructions, partly *political*, partly *ecclesiastical*," for circulation throughout all the parishes in the kingdom; and the object of these instructions was, to inculcate a cheerful submission to taxes which, though they had never received the final sanction of Parliament, had nevertheless been actually *voted*, as necessary to the general peace of Christendom, and the welfare of the Protestant Religion. By Saturday the 16th the task of Laud was completed¹: and the result of his labour has

¹ Diary, p. 35.

been preserved to us, among the documents of the time. The paper is much too long for insertion in this volume. But its importance is sufficient to warrant some notice of its general tenor. It is addressed to each of the Archbishops ; and begins by insisting on the inseparable union between the Church and State, and the necessity of mutual assistance and support, under the pressing exigences of either. It then sets forth, at some length, the imminent peril which was hanging, not over England only, but the whole of Europe, from the vast resources, and the inordinate ambition, of the House of Austria ; the re-instatement of the Romish superstition, as the probable consequence of her success ; and the ignominy which, in that case, would be indelibly fixed on this country, as the betrayer of the Protestant faith. It proceeds to remind the people, that it was by the advice of both Houses of Parliament, that all former treaties had been cancelled, and matters brought to the decision of arms ; that, consequently, the King could not now be deserted “ but with the sin and shame of all men ;” *sin*, because aid and supply, for the defence of the realm, are, at all times, due to the King from his people, by the laws of God and man,—*shame*, if the people were to forsake their King, when he was but following their own counsel. It, further, deploras the weakness and the misery which had been brought upon the kingdom by that spirit of discord which had long distracted the affections of the King’s subjects. And, after enjoining the cordial efforts of the clergy for the suppression of the pervalent divisions, it concludes as follows : “ You are to be careful that you fail not to direct and hearten our loving people, in this, and all other necessary services, both of God,

his Church, and us ; that we may have the comfort of our people's service,—the State, safety,—the Church, religion,—and the people, the enjoying of such blessings as follow these. And we end with doubling this case upon *you*, and upon all under you, in their several places ¹."

The policy, which dictated these instructions, was by no means new. It had often been resorted to by Queen Elizabeth, when she was desirous of preparing her loyal people for strong and unpalatable measures. And, in her time, the expedient was known by the significant, but somewhat irreverent, expression, of *tuning the pulpits*. But the days were gone by, in which harmony, or "healthful music," was to be anticipated, from any such experiment upon the *tone* of the public mind. The expedient was, nevertheless, applied, without hesitation, in the present emergency. The letter of the King was communicated, by the two Archbishops ², to their respective suffragans ; together with instructions to call upon their clergy, both "by *preaching*, and by private conference, to stir up all sorts of people, to express their zeal to God, their duty to the King, and their love to their

¹ These instructions may be seen, at length, in Heylyn, p. 162—165.

² It appears that Abbot took no part in the deliberations preparatory to the *Loan*, as it was called. His own words are, "If I had been in Council, when the project of the Loan was first handled, I would have used my best reasons to have it well grounded. But I was absent ; and knew not whereupon they proceeded. Only I saw that it was followed with much vehemency. And, since it was put in execution, I did not interpose myself to know the grounds of one, nor of the other."—Abbot's Narrative, Rushw. vol. i. p. 444.

country ;” and this, by submitting to taxation which had never been imposed by their representatives in Parliament !

Perhaps we may safely fix upon this as the very first political proceeding, of a seriously questionable nature, in which Laud had been engaged. It is to little purpose to allege, that he was not to blame, because he acted merely in a ministerial capacity, as a faithful subject to the King. The measure was one, which, if successful and unresisted, must have been a death-blow to a free constitution. And it is absurd to contend that the agents of a monarch, who makes any such attempt, may justly escape responsibility. The only substantial vindication of Laud, and of others who thought and acted like him, is to be sought in the extreme indistinctness of the line which, in those days, was drawn by the law, between the prerogatives of the King, and the rights of the people. We can perceive no reason whatever for believing that, when Laud was preparing these instructions, he was at all conscious of any breach of the constitution ; or guilty of any thing like a settled design against the liberties of his country, and *the fundamental laws* of the land. There were many, in those days, who honestly held it for one *fundamental law*, that, in cases of extreme exigency, it was the duty of the subject to aid the Sovereign, without waiting for the sanction of Parliament ; and that the right of calling for such aid, was an inherent and *unalienable* prerogative of the crown. And, it will scarcely be questioned, that, if ever there was an emergency which seemed to warrant the exercise of that prerogative, such an emergency had arrived, when Parliament had driven the government into a war, and then had left it destitute of supplies.

It has sometimes been vehemently asserted, that a fixed hatred of liberty was the principle of the whole conduct of King Charles; an imputation, which, if well founded, would justly consign many of his servants to infamy, as agents and ministers of despotism. It would surely be nearer to the truth to say, that his ruling principle was the fear of Parliamentary encroachment; a resolution to transmit the royal authority, in its full integrity, to his children; a desire, in short, not to alter the constitution, but, rather, to maintain the constitution, as he had been taught, from childhood, to understand it. Whether these views implied any defect of intelligence, or sagacity, is a question totally distinct. But it would be most unreasonable to regard them as indications of a want of patriotism. At the same time, it may be truly affirmed, that if ever a hatred of liberty did, for a moment, find its way into his heart, the circumstances in which he was placed were precisely fitted to introduce it there. He found himself in danger of being exposed to degradation and contempt, in the eyes of Europe. And, if such were to be the effects of freedom, is it altogether surprising that they should engender some distaste for popular institutions, even in the mind of the most patriotic prince on earth? Can it be a subject of wonder, that a monarch, thus surrounded on all sides with difficulty and dishonour, should begin to think it absolutely impossible to carry on the government, without an occasional resort to the only means yet remaining in his power? Was it wholly unnatural, that the royal prerogative should appear, to a prince so circumstanced, as a necessary moving force, in the absence of which the whole political mechanism would be liable to perpetual and

ruinous stoppage? We have, doubtless, reason to be most profoundly grateful that Charles was disabled from following out any such formidable speculations as these, into all their practical consequences. But still it must be allowed that nothing could well be more calculated, than the late proceedings of the Parliament, to drive him into such a train of thought¹.

The next step of Laud was into the Deanery of the Chapel Royal, which was vacated on the 21st of September, by the death of Dr. Lancelot Andrews, Bishop of Winchester; a prelate in all respects so admirable, that he is styled by his successor "the Light of the Christian world²." On Friday, the 6th of October, Laud was admitted to the office by Philip, Earl of Montgomery, Lord Chamberlain of the Household, before whom he took the usual oath. One of his first cares was to reform a very unbecoming practice which had prevailed since the beginning of the late reign. This custom was, that when the King entered the Chapel, the service was broken off, and the anthem sung, in order that the preacher might ascend the pulpit. The extreme irreverence of this usage was represented by the new Dean to the King. His Majesty received the suggestion with thanks. And, from that time, the prayers were always continued to the end, at whatever part of them the King might make his appearance.

1627. To return to the instructions issued by the King:—it appears that the views of Laud, dangerous and unconstitutional as they must

¹ Some notice of the views of Laud, on this subject, will be found in the ninth chapter.

² Diary, p. 36.

be deemed by us, were warmly seconded by the zeal of other Churchmen ; and, more especially, of two Divines, by the name of Sibthorpe and Manwaring. The former of these was Vicar of Brackley, in Northamptonshire. At the Spring Assizes for that county, he delivered a sermon on Rom. xiii. 7, *Render unto all their dues* ; the scope of which was to maintain the lawfulness of the general *loan*, (for that was the phrase by which the arbitrary levy was spoken of,) and the imposition of taxes, in cases of necessity, by the sovereign power of the King, without the sanction or consent of the Parliament. And the preacher, accordingly, laboured to persuade the people that they were solemnly bound, in conscience and religion, to abstain from all opposition to such loans or imposts. When this sermon was offered to the press, the King was extremely anxious that it should be speedily licensed, in order that it might be circulated throughout the country. And, if Abbot's own suspicions are well-founded, the Duke of Buckingham was earnest in recommending that the Discourse might be sent to the Archbishop for that purpose, with the view of bringing that uncourtly Prelate into difficulty and embarrassment. For, if the *imprimatur* should be granted by him, he would expose himself to public obloquy, as a friend to arbitrary government. If it should be refused, he would certainly fall under the royal indignation, as an enemy to the honour of the crown. Abbot was firm in his resolution to brave the displeasure of his sovereign, rather than betray what he regarded as the cause of his country. When the sermon was presented to him, he started various objections to its publication ; of which the most important was, that it set forth

certain doctrines in manifest opposition to the laws and customs of the realm. These objections were immediately referred to Laud¹; who, thereupon, revised the sermon, with the aid of the Bishops of Durham, Rochester, and Oxford. Their corrections were submitted to Abbot²; but in vain. He still contended that, if he were to license the book, and his Majesty were, the next day, to command that he should send to the Exchequer all the money and goods he had, he must, by his own rule, have obeyed. The same might be said of every other clergyman in the realm. Nay, if the doctrine of Sibthorpe, fortified by the support of Laud and his brethren, were to be held for law, it would place all the wealth of the city of London at the mercy of the King. It cannot be denied that all these extreme consequences might follow from the positions of the preacher. But the suggestion that any such abuse could practically result from them, gave mortal offence to his Majesty and his advisers. And this, together with Abbot's inflexible refusal of the license, caused him to be regarded at court as little better than a traitor³.

It is affirmed by Prynne, that Sibthorpe had cunningly attempted to *sweeten his sour theme*, by the insertion of some popular passages against evil counsellors, the toleration of Papists, and the profanation

¹ On the 24th of April, 1627. Diary, p. 41.

² These animadversions were the work of the whole Committee, but they were in Laud's hand-writing; for, he being then puny Bishop, the task of writing them was imposed on him. Troubles, &c. p. 357.

³ See Abbot's Narrative of this affair, in Rushw. vol. i. p. 436—444.

of the Sabbath; but that these passages had been expunged by Laud, when the discourse was submitted to his inspection: probably, because the Bishop had recently been made a Privy Counsellor; and because he was fearful lest "they should, one day, rise up in judgment against him, and be applied to himself in after times." The specimens of omission, produced by Prynne, are doubtless such as an enemy might force under sinister construction. Laud's own exposition of the matter is, that the passages in question were objected to by him, as conveying imputations most scandalously dishonourable to his Majesty and his Counsellors¹. They represented the island as in imminent danger of ruin and servitude, from the indulgence granted to Papists. They threatened all who should draw the prince to ill, with the fate of Haman, and of them that meditated the destruction of the prophet Daniel. They compared the permitted violation of the Sabbath to Solomon's divided allegiance between idols and the living God: which was recompensed by the loss and dividing of his kingdom². It will hardly be thought surprising that complaints and denunciations like these should be thought unfit for the public eye, in an age when the press was legally subject to restraint; and at a period, too, when faction was incessantly at work, to distort, to the uttermost, every action of the monarch and his servants. And, at all events, the appearance of this dangerous matter, in the discourse of Sibthorpe, will sufficiently expose the falsehood

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 357.

² Canterb. Doom, p. 245, 246.

of the imputation, that he was a creature of Bishop Laud's, and a slavish instrument of the court.

But, though Abbot was inflexible, the sermon, after all, was licensed: not by Laud, as Prynne seems to insinuate¹, but by *Montaigne*, Bishop of London. It was then published, with a Dedication to the King, under the title of "*Apostolical obedience.*" The exposition of Dr. Manwaring, however, had, if possible, a still more formidable sound in the ears of patriotism, than that of Sibthorpe. For this divine ventured, at once, on the publication of two sermons, preached by him before the King, in his capacity of Royal Chaplain: the one at Oatlands, the other at Alderton². The tendency of both these discourses was to establish the doctrine, not only that the King was not bound to observe the laws of the realm, in the imposition of taxes, or the enforcement of loans, but that the royal will, in all such matters, could not be resisted, without the peril of eternal damnation³. This, as Collier honestly observes, was "a most extravagant divinity, subversive of the constitution; and which, if pursued through all its consequences, would make Magna Charta, and the other laws for securing property, signify little⁴." With the publication of this specimen of extravagant divinity, however, we find that Laud had no concern⁵. We shall, hereafter, have occasion to remark the manner in which the House of Commons were

¹ Canterbury's Doom. p. 245.

² Hacket, pt. ii. p. 74.

³ Heylyn, p. 167.

⁴ Coll. ad anno 1627.

⁵ Diary, p. 42.

pleased to testify their sense of this exceedingly dangerous, though not altogether uncanonical, doctrine¹.

The resentment of the court was soon manifested towards Abbot, by a most invidious and unwarrantable exercise of the King's Ecclesiastical Supremacy. On the 9th of October, there was issued against the Archbishop a commission of sequestration; which appears to have been executed with circumstances of extreme harshness. The administration of his Archiepiscopal jurisdiction was consigned to the Bishops of London, Durham, Rochester, Oxford, and Bath and Wells². The offence which brought this grievous insult upon the Primate has been a matter of some dispute. By Abbot himself, however, the measure is, confidently and expressly, ascribed to the refusal of his *Imprimatur* for the ultra-loyal discourse of Dr. Sibthorpe: and this, in all probability, was the proximate cause of his disgrace. At the same time, there can be no doubt that he had long been heaping up wrath against himself; and that his firmness, in the case of Sibthorpe, was but the last of a continued series of indications, from which the court had inferred, that Abbot was defective in allegiance to the King, and fidelity to the Church. From the language of the commission itself, nothing can be concluded; for it merely states that "the Archbishop cannot, at this present, attend to the services, which are otherwise proper for his

¹ The doctrine of passive obedience is strenuously inculcated by the Bishop's book, 1537, in the exposition of the decalogue. See Formularies, &c. p. 153. 159, Oxf. edit. And the trial of Dr. Sacheverel shows with what uniformity the doctrine was maintained, from that time, till the Revolution of 1688.

² Diary, p. 42.

cognizance and jurisdiction¹." But, whatever might be the pretence for this proceeding, it would be idle to attempt the vindication of it. The circumstance is of no inconsiderable importance in the history of Laud; since it brought upon him the suspicion of an unbecoming anxiety to step into the place of the infirm and aged Prelate, while he was yet living. There appears, however, no substantial ground for this hateful imputation. It was, at this time, indeed, well known to him, that the King had designed him to be the successor of Abbot, in the Primacy². Neither is it at all improbable that he, in common with many others, had long been weary of Abbot's administration. But we do not find the Archbishop himself entertaining any suspicion that his disgrace had been brought about by Laud's impatience for his removal. The person to whom he principally attributed his humiliation, was the Duke of Buckingham; who had long and bitterly resented the Archbishop's independent bearing towards himself. He had already received some intimations of the Duke's displeasure; and he affirms that his Grace was urgent with the King, that his sequestration should take place previously to the sailing of the fleet; lest the Primate should take advantage of the Duke's absence, at Whitehall, and at the Council table³. But, whatever might be the designs of the

¹ Breviate, p. 12.

² This appears from the following entry in his Diary, Oct. 2, 1626: "The Duke related to me what the King had resolved concerning me, in case the Archbishop of Canterbury should die."

³ Abbot's Narrative, Rushw. vol. i. p. 435. 445. Those who may be desirous of more detailed information, relative to this

Archbishop's enemies, their success was but partial and transient. His banishment from the court was of no long duration. At Christmas, in the following year, 1628, he was honourably recalled from his retirement, and was then restored to his metropolitan jurisdiction; which he continued to exercise, without molestation, till his decease in 1633.

discreditable transaction, may consult Coll. vol. ii. p. 742. Hacket's Williams, pt. i. p. 68. But, more especially, Abbot's Narrative, Rushw. vol. i. p. 434—457.

CHAPTER IV.

A.D. 1628—1630.

Charles's third Parliament—Petition of Right—Proceedings against Manwaring—Remonstrance of the Commons—Laud in danger—He draws up an answer to the Remonstrance—He is translated to the See of London—Assassination of Buckingham—Laud's conduct at the examination of Felton—Laud reforms the disorders in the election of Proctors, at Oxford—His zeal for the advancement of Literature—Reprint of the 39 Articles, with the Royal Declaration prefixed—Exasperation of the Puritans—The Vow, or Protestation, of the Commons—Laud draws up an Answer—The wisdom and moderation of his Views—The third Parliament dissolved—Laud is threatened by the Puritanical faction—Royal Injunctions of 1629—Laud's apprehensions for the Church and State—He is made Chancellor of the University of Oxford—Punishment of Leighton for publishing "Zion's plea against the Prelates"—Laud had no concern in the Sentence—He consecrates St. Catherine Cree, and other Churches, and is charged with using Superstitious Ceremonies—This charge considered.

1628. WHEN Charles's third Parliament assembled, the nation was involved, by the insane counsels of Buckingham, in a most unpopular, and, hitherto, most unsuccessful, war with France. At the opening of this Parliament, on the 17th of March, Bishop Laud preached, once more, on the excellence of unity. The text of this discourse was echoed by the King in his speech to the two Houses; for his Majesty concluded his address by expressing a hope "that they would follow the sacred advice lately inculcated, to *maintain the unity of the spirit*

in the bond of peace." The Lord Keeper, then, enlarged upon the formidable power of Austria, the mighty preparations of Spain, the distractions prevalent in the Netherlands, the dangers of the Reformed Religion *in France*, and the consequent necessities of the Crown. The words, however, were addressed to sluggish ears. The Commons seemed resolved to think of nothing but the dangers which, as they alleged, were besetting the Reformed Religion *in England*; and, of the still more imminent peril which threatened the personal liberties of English subjects. Their first measure was to move the House of Peers to join them in an address to the King, for the more effectual suppression of Popery; their next, to digest the propositions which were afterwards embodied in the celebrated *Petition of Right*. But this was not all. "They thought they had not done themselves right enough in disputing their property with the King in Parliament, if they suffered it to be *preached down* in the court and country¹." The House of Commons, accordingly, resumed the exercise of their inquisitorial power. They drew up a declaration against Dr. Manwaring, for the obnoxious sermons he had delivered; and this they presented to the Lords, at a conference, in which Pym was the manager. The offensive passages were read, and aggravated to the very height; and the judgment of the Lords was demanded against the writer. On the 13th of June he was brought before them, to answer for himself. The next day, notwithstanding his humble, and almost abject submission, they sentenced him to imprisonment during

¹ Heylyn, p. 179.

the pleasure of the House; ordered him to pay a fine of £1000 to the King; condemned him to make such submission as should be set down by a committee, in writing, both at the bar, and in the House of Commons; interdicted him from ever preaching again at court, and, for three years, from exercising his ministry any where; pronounced him disabled from holding any ecclesiastical dignity, or secular office; and, finally, resolved that his Majesty should be moved to call in the book by proclamation, and cause it to be publicly burned¹!

Whatever might be the demerits of Manwaring, it would be extremely difficult to reconcile the above proceeding to the forms, or to the spirit, of the constitution. It appears to have been something in the nature of an impeachment; though it had little of the formality of that solemn process. At all events, it was a most portentous stretch of Parliamentary power. If the Commons regarded the discourses of Manwaring as amounting to a dangerous political libel, the Attorney General might have been instructed to deal with them accordingly. If they considered those discourses as a scandal upon religion, they might have voted a resolution to that effect; and stigmatised the publication of them, as calling for the censures of the ecclesiastical tribunal. The irregular and summary course which they actually followed, and the outrageous sentence pronounced by the Lords, at their imperious demand, were exactly fitted to awaken the reasonable resentments of the King, and the fears of his best counsellors and most faithful subjects. The sentiments

¹ See Rushw. vol. i. p. 585, 586. 593—605.

of his Majesty, respecting this proceeding, were, soon after, very intelligibly manifested by the issue of the Royal pardon to Manwaring, and by his promotion, first, to the living of Stamford Rivers in Essex; next, to the Deanery of Worcester; and, finally, to the Bishopric of St. David's. So that, as Heylyn observes, the Parliamentary thunders "did rather affrighten than hurt him." The royal indulgence towards the delinquent, however, was angrily remembered by the Commons; who, doubtless, intended to crush a man, whom they regarded as the slavish advocate of despotism.

The sentence on Manwaring was but the prelude to an assault on Bishop Laud, and other reputed champions of Popery and Prerogative. On the 11th of June, the Commons had resolved, that the Duke of Buckingham was the main cause of all the grievances in the kingdom. On the 12th, they vented their indignation against Laud, for having warranted Dr. Manwaring's sermons to the press. On the 14th, they proceeded to a consideration of this charge, which, on examination, appeared to be utterly unfounded¹. On the same day, they were employed in the preparation of a *remonstrance*, in which they complained of innovations in religion; of the countenance shown to Recusants; and of the daily growth of the faction of the *Arminians*, who were said to be *Protestants* in show, but *Jesuits* in opinion and practice: of which faction, they denounced Neile, then Bishop of Winchester, and Laud, Bishop of Bath and Wells, as the patrons and the leaders. Having, then, produced a variety of

¹ Diary, p. 42, 43.

other grievances, they concluded by complaining of the monopoly of offices in the person of the Duke, and of his pernicious abuse of the power thus entrusted to him¹.

There can be no doubt that this remonstrance was but the visible eruption of a fire which had, for some time past, been gathering beneath the feet of Laud, and his ambitious patron. So long ago as the month of October, 1627, the Dean of Canterbury, and Sir Dudley Digges, had anticipated the failure of the expedition to the Isle of Rhè, and had told Dr. Williams, that there must be a Parliament; in which case, some sacrifices must be made; and none more likely than Bishop Laud. These whispers having reached the ear of the Bishop, he communicated them to the King; whose reply was "Trouble not yourself with any reports, till you see me forsake my other friends²." It was now evident, from the temper of the House, that Laud was, more than ever, in a condition to need all the comfort and encouragement that could be derived from these gracious expressions of his master. For, in the course of the debate upon the *remonstrance*, some honourable member suggested, that, having named therein the Bishops of Winchester and Bath, it might be as well for them to think of some causes, why they did so. Upon which, Sir Edward Coke instantly stood up, and said, "Have we not named my Lord of Buckingham, without showing a cause? And may we not be as bold with these two Bishops³?" From which

¹ See the *remonstrance*, in Rushw. vol. i. p. 619—626.

² Diary, p. 42. Lloyd's Memoirs, p. 227. Ed. 1668.

³ Diary, p. 45.

slight occurrence it is tolerably clear, that the time was, even then, approaching, when the hot pursuit of liberty would leave all sense of justice very far behind it.

The remonstrance against Buckingham was, of course, disagreeable enough to the King. The remonstrance against Tonnage and Poundage, which was speedily to have followed it, was absolutely intolerable. This blow, however, was intercepted by Charles, in the very instant when it was about to fall. On the 26th of June, while the Commons were engaged in hearing that document finally read, the King came suddenly to the House of Lords, sent for the Speaker and the Commons, delivered a sharp speech, in which he told them that their first remonstrance was such as no wise man could justify¹, and that the second, which they were preparing, would deprive him of one of the chiefest maintenances of his crown; and then prorogued the Parliament to the 20th of October. The session, however, was a memorable one². It had secured for the people of England the glorious law known by the name of the *Petition of Right*. From this moment, any attempt to invade their property or personal freedom was sure to be resented, not only as tyrannical, but as hatefully perfidious.

The remonstrance having been printed and circu-

¹ This rebuke gave the bitterest offence to the popular party. "The chief tribunes spake their discontents aloud, that they had given a bountiful levy of five subsidies, and were called fools for their labour!" Hacket's *Williams*, pt. ii. p. 79. "And yet," adds Hacket, "how many kings had treated both Houses more sharply, upon less provocation!"

² *Rushw.* vol. i. p. 628—632.

lated by order of the Commons, a proclamation was issued by the King for its suppression: and, when the session was ended, an answer to it was deemed indispensable; and Laud was commissioned to draw it up. In this paper, his Majesty declares himself quite as averse from innovation as they who think they do well to fear it so excessively. He denies that the alleged indulgence to the Papists amounted to a dispensation of the laws against them. The composition made with Recusants was, rather, a financial measure, for the supply of the treasury, which had been left unfurnished. With regard to the daily growth of the *Arminian* faction, it was "a mere dream of them that wake; and would cause his Majesty's loving and loyal people to think that he slept the while." In that charge, too,—his Majesty added,—great wrong was done to two eminent Prelates, that attended on his person; for they were accused without the least show or shadow of proof. Should they, or any other, attempt religious innovation, either by open practice, or cunning device, his Majesty would quickly dispose of them, without staying for a *remonstrance*." The complaint respecting the suppression of orthodox books, and the discouragement of good preachers, he said, was equally unfounded. The proclamation had commanded a restraint *on both sides*, till such time as the passions of men should subside; and a due obedience to it would have effectually prevented the present agitation. As for the distribution of Church preferment, he would take care that it should be the means of rewarding desert and pains: but he would be, himself, the judge of the desert, and not be taught by a *remonstrance*. With respect to Ireland (the state of

which had been pointedly adverted to by the Commons), it was, to say the least, in no worse condition than that in which it was left by Queen Elizabeth : and he had too much confidence in his Deputy and Council there, to believe that they would leave him in ignorance of the creation of new monasteries and superstitious houses in that kingdom, if any such establishments had been, in fact, attempted. In conclusion, he averred, that, whatever might be the violence with which religion might be threatened in other parts, there was no undermining practice against it, at home ; if *they* practise not against it, who seem most to labour for it. And he recommended to all, an amendment of life, as the best and truest of all religious *remonstrances* ¹.

The language and tone of this paper was not, perhaps, of that soft description which *turneth away wrath*. The composition of it formed, afterwards, one formidable item of accusation against Laud. He pleaded, as was usual with him, on similar occasions, that, in preparing it, he did but obey the express commands of his Majesty, as he was bound to do, conformably to his oath as a sworn Counsellor ; that he closely adhered to the royal instructions ; and that, with regard to "the sour and bitter passages," which it was said to contain, there might be some expressions in it too big for the mouth of a subject, and yet, not unfit to be uttered by a King ². It

¹ Heylyn, p. 182, 183.

² Troubles, &c. p. 406, 407 : from which, it would appear that, after all, the answer was not published. For Laud is charged, among other things, with "being displeased that it was never printed." Prynne, however, found a copy of it in the Bishop's study.

does not seem to have been understood either by Charles or his advisers, that the language fittest for a King is that of sedate and unimpassioned dignity; and that he does but degrade and enfeeble his authority, whenever he shows himself capable of the same tumultuous excitement which may agitate his subjects.

On the 15th of July, in this year, Laud was translated to the See of London; a post which brought him into more immediate conflict with the faction, which, in his deliberate belief, was engaged in one incessant conspiracy against the Established Church. One of his first acts was to assist at the consecration of Dr. Montague, nominated by the King to the See of Chichester. This was a promotion in which his Majesty may be said to have shown more of magnanimity than of prudence; since it was sure to exasperate the Commons, under whose censures Montague had so recently fallen. It was on the 24th of August, while occupied in this solemnity at Croydon, together with the Archbishop, and the Bishops of Winchester, Ely, and Carlisle, that Laud received the afflicting intelligence of Buckingham's assassination by Felton. The grief of Laud for this bereavement, is vividly painted in several of his letters to J. G. Vossius; more particular in one, dated October 25, 1628, in which he thus expresses himself:—"I will say no more, lest my heart should break, and my spirit take its flight. The man is dead to whom we both owe so much." And again, "I return to the unutterable sorrows which overwhelm me, for the slaughter of the illustrious Duke, ever to be deplored. I doubt not that he has reached heaven. We remain dwellers upon earth, which

Astrea has abandoned. Consider well your own loss, mine is infinite." In another letter he intimates that this calamity threw him into a severe illness, from which he scarcely had recovered¹. The depth and sincerity of his sorrow is further attested by the language of his private devotions². And it appears from the same evidence, that, in his honest persuasion, the death of his friend was to be ascribed to the machinations of that party who were then arrayed against the government. This suspicion, however, seems to have been unfounded. The assassin was one of those melancholy fanatics who are always sure to be found, in times of fierce political and religious agitation : but he was without the slightest connexion, that has ever been discovered, with any individual of note or influence ; and he died in penitence for his crime. Nevertheless, it is scarcely to be doubted, that the atrocity must have had the effect of deepening the antipathy of Laud for the whole tribe of Puritans ; and must have helped to fortify him in the conviction, that compromise with them was little less than treason to his sovereign and his country.

On the 9th of September, Laud attended the Court for the first time after the murder of the Duke.

¹ J. G. Voss. Epist. 98. p. 62. Epist. 103. p. 65. Prest. Vir. Epist. No. 460. p. 734. Diary, p. 43. September 27, 1628.

² The prayer composed by him, on this occasion, contains the following petition :—"Lay open the bottom of that *irreligious and graceless plot* that spilt his blood. Bless and preserve the King from danger, and in security, in these dangerous times." The constancy and fervency with which he used this prayer is, of course, turned to his reproach by Prynne, who says "When this Duke was slain, he used this special prayer, much daubed, through frequent use, *with his fingers.*" Breviate, p. 14.

He was received with many gracious speeches by the King; and, thenceforth, appeared to occupy the foremost place in his Majesty's confidence¹. In November, Felton was examined before the Council. Laud, of course, was present: and it will scarcely be thought surprising that he should be betrayed into some passionate expression of his grief and horror. But it is most deeply to be lamented, that he was utterly unable to overmaster these emotions during the solemn proceedings at the Council-table; and that he so far forgot the Statesman and the Bishop, as to threaten Felton with the rack, if he should persevere in refusing to discover his accomplices. On reference to the Judges, it was unanimously declared by them, that no such punishment as torture is known or allowed by our law. And the consequence was precisely what might be expected from this unfortunate eruption of violence and passion,—namely, the immediate circulation of the saying, that “Crown Law was more favourable to the subject than Crown Divinity²!”

But, although it must be admitted, that such a proposal ought never to have fallen from the lips of a Father of the Church, it should not be forgotten, that, after all, the inhumanity of it belonged rather to the age, than to the man. The application of the rack might, indeed, be unknown to our *law*: but it certainly was not unknown to our *practice*. To mention no other instances, the rack had been resorted to for the purpose of extorting a confession from Guy Fawkes: and, under these circumstances,

¹ Diary, p. 43.

² Heylyn, p. 187. Rushw. vol. i. p. 637—639.

a churchman might well be excused for a mistake upon a question, which required the decision of all the Judges of the land. Besides, the practice was then common in many other parts of Christendom : and every one knows how prodigally it was applied by Richelieu ; with whom Laud has sometimes been compared, with a view to his disparagement.

One of the first cares of Laud, on his promotion to the See of London, was to rescue the University of Oxford from the scandal occasioned by the scenes of disgraceful turbulence which were usually incident to the annual election of Proctors. These disorders he proposed to correct by the construction of a Cycle, which should distribute the turns according to the extent and importance of the foundations. The measure was submitted by him to the Council-board ; and, having first received the royal sanction, was gratefully accepted by the University, in Convocation, without a single dissentient voice¹. His zeal for the advancement of literature was equal to his anxiety for the preservation of discipline. He prevailed upon the Earl of Pembroke to purchase no less than 240 Greek manuscripts, and to present them to the University : and, shortly after twenty-eight more were sent to him, for the same destination, by Sir Thomas Roe, who had been King James's Ambassador to the Mogul², and had been employed by Buckingham in making these literary collections. These were peaceable and gratifying offices. But his eminent rank in the Church now called him to a much more dangerous field of exer-

¹ Diary, p. 43. Heylyn, p. 193, 194.

² Diary, p. 44.

tion. He had perceived that the King's Proclamation of 1626, had been very imperfectly observed throughout the kingdom. Some respect had been shown to it in the market-towns, in which it had been published. But there were many ministers in the country, who found it convenient to be ignorant of these injunctions ; and who, up to that time, had continued to disregard them with impunity. To remedy this mischief, Laud advised his Majesty to order a reprint of the Thirty-nine Articles, with a Declaration prefixed, for the purpose of guarding them from misconstruction. This counsel was adopted, and the Declaration published. This document, after some preliminary matter, reminds the people, that the Sovereign is the supreme governor of the Church of England, and that the Clergy, in Convocation, are to settle all matters of ecclesiastical polity : first, receiving permission so to do, under the broad Seal ; and subsequently obtaining the royal assent to their ordinances and constitutions. It further alludes to certain unhappy differences by which the Church had been distracted, in the interpretation of her Articles ; and, then, concludes as follows : " We will that all further curious search be laid aside, and those disputes be shut up in God's promises, as they be generally set forth to us in holy Scripture, and the general meaning of the Articles of the Church of England, according to them : that no man, hereafter, shall either print or preach, to draw the Article aside any way ; but shall submit to it, in the full and plain meaning thereof, and shall not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense : that, if any public reader in either

of our Universities, or any head or master of a College, or any other person respectively in either of them, shall affix any new sense to an Article, or shall publicly read, determine, or hold, any public disputation, or suffer any such to be held either way, in either the Universities, or Colleges, respectively ; or if any divine in the Universities, shall preach or print any thing, either way, other than is established in Convocation, with our royal assent ; he, or they, the offenders, shall be liable to our displeasure, and the Church's censure, in our commission ecclesiastical, as well as any other : And we will see there shall be due execution upon them ¹."

To any impartial and dispassionate inquirer, the above instrument will appear to be little more than a Proclamation, issued by the King, as Supreme Head of the Church, for the purpose of protecting her from the evils incident to a licentious exercise of private judgment, and from the discord which must arise from the fanatical perversion of her doctrines, and the factious violation of her discipline. It introduces no new principle. It threatens no unheard of or arbitrary punishment. It merely declares, in effect, that all who abuse the office of exposition, or interpretation, to the disturbance of the Church's peace, shall be objects of his Majesty's displeasure ; and that this displeasure shall be manifested by a vigorous enforcement of ecclesiastical authority. Nevertheless, if we are to judge by the manner in which it was received by the unquiet spirits of that generation, the document in question was neither

¹ Heylyn, p. 188, 189, where the whole declaration is printed ; but without a date.

more nor less than an intolerable edict, involving all the guilt of impiety and despotism! The exasperation produced by it, speedily became both visible and audible. The Parliament, 1629. which had been prorogued in October, assembled on the 20th of January. The King sent a message to the House, requiring them speedily to take the bill for Tonnage and Poundage under consideration. The Commons were in no humour to comply: first, because the bill ought wholly to originate with themselves; secondly, because there was much heavy work in hand, for their Committee of Religion. The Calvinistic party proclaimed, that, beyond all doubt, the recent declaration was designed for no other purpose than the suppression of Calvinists, and the encouragement of Arminians¹: and their fury knew no bounds. The depths of Satan, they exclaimed, were opened; the Arminians were invited to sow their tares; a Jesuitical plot was formed for the subversion of the Gospel, and for the suppression of godly and painful ministers. A petition had, accordingly, been prepared by certain London ministers (which, however, was stopped before it reached the throne), bitterly deprecating this restraint on the saving doctrines of God's free grace, in election and predestination, and predicting imminent ruin to the *State*, from that enemy of God, *Arminius*². In the House of Commons, learning, both sacred and profane, was ransacked for terms of reprobation, to brand the *Arminian* corruptions. One specimen may suffice.

¹ Rushw, vol. i. p. 653.

² Heylyn, p. 190. Cant. Doom. p. 164, 165, where the whole of this petition is given.

“ I desire” said Rous, (afterwards the Speaker of Cromwell’s Parliament,) “ I desire that we may consider the increase of Arminianism ; an error that makes the grace of God lackey it after the will of man ; that makes the sheep to keep the Shepherd ; and makes a mortal seed of an immortal God. Yea, I desire that we should look into the very belly and bowels of this Trojan horse ; to see if there be not men in it, ready to open the gates to Romish tyranny, and Spanish Monarchy. For an Arminian is the spawn of a Papist ; and if there come warmth of favour upon him, you shall see him turn into one of those frogs that rise out of the bottomless pit. And, if you mark it well, you shall see an Arminian reaching out his hand to a Papist, a Papist to a Jesuit ; and a Jesuit gives one hand to the Pope, and another to the King of Spain. And these men, having kindled a fire in our neighbour country, they have now brought over some of it hither, to set on flame this kingdom also.” The Arminians, in short, were a band of subtle conspirators against the honour, the liberty, and the religion of their country. Arminianism itself was a prodigy, which combined all the abominations of Popery, Despotism, and Impiety. And, of this three-headed monster, Laud was denounced as the keeper : ready, at any moment, to unchain it, and to let it loose, to hunt and tear in pieces the people of God ¹. The zeal of the Commons, at last, collected itself into the form of a solemn vow, or protestation, to the following effect :—“ We the Commons, in Parliament assembled, do claim, protest, and avow for

¹ See the debates and proceedings on this subject in Rushw. vol. i. p. 645—660. Cant. Doom. p. 165.

truth, the sense of the Articles of Religion, which were established by Parliament, in the thirteenth year of our late Queen Elizabeth¹, which, by the public act of the Church of England, and current exposition of the writers of our Church, have been delivered unto us. And we reject the sense of the Jesuits and Arminians, and all others, wherein they differ from us².

A reader, not much acquainted with theological controversy, might here, possibly, be induced to pause; and to ask, what was an *Arminian*? What were the opinions, and the practices, of the enemy to God and man, who bore that name? And he would, doubtless, be much surprised to learn, that an Arminian was one who rejected the doctrine, which affirms that men are doomed to eternal happiness or misery by an arbitrary and irrevocable decree, and that the grace of God is so absolutely indefectible, that the elect can never fall away; one who believed that the scheme of redemption was, in its design, universal; one who maintained that the human will is not in a state of positive slavery; one, likewise, who did not hold it altogether damnable to entertain some doubts, whether the Church of Rome were pre-figured by the scarlet woman of the Apocalypse; and

¹ It is justly remarked by Heylyn, p. 192, that in Elizabeth's time, some ministers being stiffly wedded to their old *mumpsimus* of the mass, and others to their new *sumpsimus* of inconformity, it was necessary that the doctrine of the Church should be kept inviolate; and that, for this end, subscription was required to the Articles of 1562: but that Parliamentary *Committees of Religion*, either to examine the orthodoxy, or to fix the sense, of the Articles, were things unheard of in that reign.

² Rushw. vol. i. p. 649, 650.

who, moreover, conceived it possible that a member of that communion might be saved. These were the opinions then branded by the title of *Arminian*; as if they had been so many pernicious novelties, with which the Church of Christ had been infested by the celebrated Dutch Divine, *Arminius*; whereas, in fact, the same opinions had been held, by many of the wisest and most moderate of our own divines, long before the name of *Arminius* was known in England. Besides,—what would be the astonishment of the inquirer, on learning, further, that the malcontents were agitated with the fiercest spirit of Romish intolerance, at the very moment when they were raving against Rome! In 1623, Archbishop Abbot had addressed a letter to King James, in which he declared, that, to grant a toleration in religion, would be to set up the most damnable and heretical doctrine of the Church of Rome, the whore of Babylon¹. The recent remonstrance of the Commons had pronounced all composition with Recusants, to be a toleration odious to God². And there can be no reasonable doubt, that they who were thus clamorous for the suppression of Popery, would have loudly hailed the royal declaration, if it had laid an interdict on that spawn of Popery—Arminianism. It is notorious, that they regarded a believer in free-will with nearly as much abhorrence as a disbeliever in Revelation; and would have committed the preaching of the Gospel to an atheist, almost as willingly as to an Arminian heretic.

Such were tempers which became half frantic, because an attempt was made to banish the festering

¹ Rushw. vol. i. p. 85.

² Ibid. p. 621.

plague of controversy, at a time when religious enthusiasm and political discontent had formed the closest alliance with each other. The wild strife and confusion around him, appear to have had but little terror for Laud. To the memorable *vow*, of the Commons, he drew up the heads of a calm and sedate answer; which, however, was not published, but was afterwards found among his papers. The most important sentences of this document, are those with which it concludes; "All consent, in all ages, (as far as I have observed,) to an Article or Canon, is, to itself, as it is laid down in the body of it; and if it will bear more senses than one, it is lawful for any man to choose what sense his judgment directs him to: so that it be a sense, *secundum analogiam fidei*, and that he holds it peaceably, without distracting the Church. And the wisdom of the Church hath been, in all ages, or in most, to require consent to articles, *in general*, as much as may be; because this is the way of unity. And the Church, in high points, requiring assent to particulars, hath been rent."¹ This, undeniably, is, at least, the language of moderation: and, that it was the dictate of an honest and single heart, is evident, both from the tenor of his life, and from his private correspondence. In a letter addressed to J. G. Vossius, in the following year, 1629, (having mentioned, as a reason for his silence on religious matters in England, his unwillingness to anger a sore, or to expose his own country) he expresses himself as follows: "I have spared no pains to prevent these dangerous and intricate questions from being handled before the people: lest, under the colour of truth, we

¹ See Heylyn, p. 192.

should violate godliness and charity. I have always been for moderate counsels ; lest men of hot tempers, with whom religion is not the main object, should throw all things into confusion. This course may not, perhaps, have given satisfaction. Nevertheless, I have kept in mind how solemnly our Saviour recommended charity to his followers ; and with what caution and patience his apostle wishes us to treat the weak. If I should perish by using arts like these, my recompense will be with me : and except in God, I will seek for no consolation beyond myself With the blessing of God, I will endeavour that truth and peace may embrace each other. If, for our sins, God should deny us this blessing, my own hope will be for the peace which is eternal ¹."

The short remainder of this Session shows how vain had been the efforts of the King to open it under pacific auspices. Previously to its commencement, he had issued a proclamation for the execution of the laws against Jesuits and Recusants. He had ordered the apprehension of one Smith, a Popish Priest, who, as Bishop of Chalcedon, was exercising episcopal jurisdiction in this country. He had recalled Archbishop Abbot to court, with circumstances of honour, and had desired his attendance at the Council Board. He had promoted Dr. Potter, then a decided Calvinist, to the See of Carlisle. He had even called in the book of Dr. Montague, as being "the first cause of all the differences which had troubled the quiet of the Church ²." But all these things had profited him

¹ *Præstantium Virorum Epistolæ* ; Ep. 471. p. 740 (b) ; dated July 14th, 1629.

² Heylyn, p. 195.

nothing. The last of his concessions, more especially, was thought to be little better than a mockery. The book of Montague, it was alleged, had been published three years; had been widely circulated; and had done its mischief: and the writer had been *punished* with a good Bishopric. The discountenancing of his work was scorned as a transparent artifice, adopted only for the purpose of disarming the gainsayers. These unfortunate impressions had been rendered indelible, by the royal declaration. And the effect was, that the House of Commons was converted, during the Session, into a sort of *General Assembly* of the Church. The Committee of Religion was overwhelmed with work. Reports and Petitions were incessantly rushing in upon it, from every quarter. Not only the restraint of books against Popery and Arminianism, and the prosecution of orthodox writers and publishers, but the transformation of communion tables into altars,—the practice of standing up at the reading of the Gospel and the Doxology,—the bowing at the name of Jesus,—in short, all imaginable abuses in discipline or doctrine,—were dragged before this formidable inquest. The patience of his Majesty was, at last, exhausted. On the 2nd of March, he sent a message to the House, (which may well make modern ears to tingle,) commanding their *adjournment*. In obedience to this order, the Speaker was about to leave the chair: but he was forcibly detained in it, till three Resolutions were passed; the *first* against innovators in religion; the *second* against those who should counsel the levying of tonnage and poundage, without consent of Parliament; the *third* against all who should yield a voluntary submission to the exaction. Having denounced all such persons,

as capital enemies to the commonwealth, the House admitted the Sergeant-at-arms ; and then adjourned in the midst of unspeakable confusion¹. On the 10th of March, the Parliament was dissolved.

This dissolution was soon followed by a royal proclamation ; in which, his Majesty began by censuring the tumultuous occurrences which had attended the close of the Parliament, and the false and pernicious rumours, circulated by several members of the House of Commons, that liberty and religion were in danger. He, then, adverted to certain reports which had been spread abroad, for evil purposes, to the effect, that a new Parliament must soon be called². And, he added that, although “his Majesty had showed, by his frequent meeting with his people, his love of Parliaments, yet, the late abuse having, *for the present*, driven him out of that course, he should account it presumption for any to *prescribe* to his Majesty a time for Parliaments ; the time for calling, continuing, or dissolving them, being in the King’s own power³.” Upon grounds so light as these,—if Clarendon may be credited,—it was commonly understood that the King had inhibited all men even to speak of another Parliament ; and the minds of many

¹ Rushw. vol. i. p. 662.

² That such an impression existed, is manifest, from the following passage in a letter of Sir H. Wotton to Sir Edmund Bacon, dated March 6th, a few days before the dissolution : “Some think the Parliament doth yet hang upon a thread, and may be stitched together again. But that is an airy conceit. Yet the peace of Italy, and the preparations of France against us, are voiced so strongly, that *I verily believe we shall have a new summons.*” Reliq. Wotton : p. 444. Ed. 1685.

³ Parl. Hist. Col. 524, 525. Ann. 1629.

were filled with apprehensions of a fixed design to alter the form of government, both in Church and State¹. And, most unfortunately for Laud, both this, and every other unpopular measure of the time, was, without hesitation, and as matter of course, principally ascribed to his traitorous and pernicious counsels. The pardon and promotion of Montague and Manwaring,—the violation of the privileges of the Commons by a Sheriff's officer,—the Message of the King to adjourn the House,—and, finally, the dissolution of the Parliament,—all were charged, more or less confidently, to this notorious heretic and traitor! By him, and his junta, was let loose the whole legion of mischiefs which besieged the commonwealth. And a proposition was once actually made by Sir John Elliot, that the King should be petitioned to leave him, and his confederate Neile, to the mercy of the House². Laud himself was painfully conscious that the Parliament had sought his ruin: though he congratulates himself that they were able to “find nothing against him³.” It soon appeared that his enemies out of the House, were quite as active and virulent as those within it. On Sunday the 29th of March, two papers were found in the yard, before the house of the Dean of St. Paul's. The one was to this effect: “Laud, look to thyself. Be assured thy life is sought. As thou art the fountain of all wickedness, repent thee of thy monstrous sins, before thou be taken out of the world. And assure thyself, that neither God nor the world can endure

¹ Clar., vol. i. p. 118, 119.

² Heylyn, p. 197.—Rushw. vol. i. p. 653—660.

³ Diary, p. 44.

such a vile counsellor or whisperer to live." The other of these papers, equally furious, was directed against the Lord Treasurer, Weston; and both papers were, that same night, delivered by the Dean into the hands of the King. They extorted from Laud only a recorded acknowledgment, in his Diary, of his frailty as a man; with a brief appeal to the Almighty, for deliverance from them that "hated him without a cause¹."

By this time, the war with France and Spain was terminated; and the sovereign and his people were left at liberty to cultivate the arts of peace. The chief care of Bishop Laud was accordingly directed towards the Church, the condition of which was such as deeply to stir the spirit of one so devoted to its prosperity and honour. "He saw her," says his biographer, "decaying in power and patrimony: her patrimony dilapidated by the avarice of several bishops, in making havoc of their woods, to enrich themselves; and, more than so, in filling up their grants and leases to the utmost term, after they had been nominated to other Bishoprics, to the great wrong of their successors. Her power he found diminished, partly by the Bishops themselves, in leaving their Dioceses unregarded, and living altogether about Westminster, to be in a more ready way for the next preferment; partly by the great increase of Chaplains in the houses of many private gentlemen; but, chiefly, by the multitude of irregular Lecturers, both in city and country, whose work it was to undermine as well the doctrine as the government of it²." The truth of this representation is sufficiently

¹ Diary, p. 44.

² Heylyn, p. 198, 199.

attested by a document which was prepared by Laud, and speedily published under the title of "His Majesty's Instructions to the Archbishop of Canterbury, containing certain orders to be observed by the several Bishops in his Province." By these orders, their Lordships were strictly enjoined to keep residence in their Episcopal Houses, if such houses existed,—to enforce, in their Visitation Charges, the observance of the King's Declaration,—to be careful that their Ordinations should be solemnly conducted,—and that Holy Orders should not be conferred upon unworthy persons. They were further instructed to keep a vigilant eye upon the *Lecturers*; to encourage grave and orthodox Divines; to suffer none but noblemen, and persons qualified by law, to have domestic Chaplains; and to notice all who should absent themselves, whether as Recusants or otherwise, from Divine Service. They were forbidden, on pain of forfeiting all hopes of translation, to execute ruinous leases, or to cut down timber on the Episcopal Estates: it being "a hateful thing that any man's leaving a Bishopric should almost undo his successor." They were, lastly, commanded to render to his Majesty a yearly account of their obedience to these injunctions. Under the head of *Lecturers*, the same paper contained the following regulations:—1. That Catechising should, generally, be substituted for Afternoon Sermons. 2. That the Lecturer should read the Church Service, in his surplice, before the lecture. 3. That the Lecturers, in market-towns, should be orthodox Divines, and should preach in *gowns*, and not in *cloaks*. 4. That no Lecturer should be appointed by a corporation, but under the

condition of his readiness to take a benefice with cure of souls, as soon as one could fairly be procured for him¹.

These injunctions, perhaps, are such as no king of England would think of issuing, in the present state of the British Constitution. But to a person who will throw his mind back into those times, the greater part of them will, assuredly, appear to be, not only far from unreasonable or tyrannical, but, in their tendency, most salutary and admirable. They were, nevertheless, extremely unsatisfactory to the various parties who were touched by their provisions. The holders of the poorer Bishoprics complained that they were compelled to residence in their Episcopal houses ; since this would involve a scale of hospitable living, to which their revenues were unequal. They, likewise, thought it hard that they should be obliged to put up with the poverty which the acts of their covetous predecessors had left them ; and yet should be debarred from carving out a compensation for themselves, by the application of similar practices. The country gentlemen were sorely chafed by the restraint upon their privilege of entertaining domestic Chaplains : and the Chaplains were no better pleased by a restriction, which tended to mar their hopes of preferment, and to deprive them of the solace, which they found in aristocratic licence and plenty, for the scanty commons and austere discipline which they had endured in their halls and colleges. The Puritanical party were still more bitterly discontent than Chaplains, or country gentlemen, or Bishops. What, they exclaimed, could be the object of these instruc-

¹ Heylyn, p. 199, 200.

tions, but to suppress, or at least to fetter, the ordinance of preaching? And what must be the result, but negligence in the priests, ignorance in the people, and, eventually, the triumph of Popery and superstition throughout the realm? And then, how intolerable was it that the office of Catechizing—a task fitter for pedagogues than for men mighty in the Scriptures—should be imposed upon *preachers*, who rather were ordained to provide strong meat for men, than milk for babes? And how awful was the thought, that their teaching must be restrained to the exposition of God's will revealed, while his secret purposes were to be kept sealed up under lock and key! And (to crown the whole of these *gravamina*) was it to be endured that the *Lecturers* should be dressed up in the Popish masquerade of gown and surplice; or shackled with parochial cures, and, consequently, with articles and subscriptions; all badges of Antichrist, and clogs upon the freedom of the Gospel¹?

The *Lecturers* of those times, it must here be observed, stood towards the Calvinistic party in a relation somewhat similar to that which, in former days, was held by the mendicant orders towards the Papacy. They constituted a sort of irregular levy, unknown to the ancient parochial system of the kingdom. They itinerated from house to house, and from parish to parish. They intruded upon the ministrations of the local Clergy. And, in some of the larger market-towns, they formed a fraternity, who were appointed to preach in rotation. Being destitute of any permanent endowment, they were

¹ Heylyn, p. 202.

placed in a state of slavish dependence on the caprices of their congregations. They were, in short, the originals and prototypes of all those religious adventurers, who are ready to take service under that which, in modern phrase, is termed the *Voluntary System*. Devout and zealous men might, possibly, be found among them. But it scarcely can be questioned that the spirit of faction and fanaticism was, likewise, among the moving forces which produced their activity. And it is next to certain, that no zeal or devotion of individuals can adequately compensate the mischief which must be occasioned, in the course of time, by the subversion of ecclesiastical discipline and order, and by the prostration of the spirit of independence in the Clerical order. Archbishop Abbot appears to have thought otherwise. He could not refuse to circulate the royal instructions; but he took care to make it known that he did so with no good will: for, when two intractable *Lecturers*, named Palmer and Udney, had been suspended by the Dean and Archdeacon of Canterbury, he restored them to their lectureships, and inhibited the Archdeacon from the exercise of his jurisdiction. By this proceeding, he held up the King's injunctions to public contempt and scorn, and fomented the spreading temper of disaffection and sedition¹.

In the midst of all this secret murmuring and open clamour, Laud remained unmoved. He summoned the Ministers of London and its neighbourhood to appear before him; pointed out to them the absolute necessity of the Instructions; and apprized them of

¹ See Can t. Doom. p. 372, 373.

his resolution to enforce them. He despatched letters to every Archdeacon in his Diocese, requiring them to insist on the publication of those orders, and to furnish him with an account of their proceedings at the end of their respective Visitations. For a time, the other Bishops followed the same course, with a considerable show of vigour: and, in some instances, the more contumacious of the preachers were made to pay dearly for their extravagance. But the zeal and activity of the Prelates gradually languished, when the first impulse began to exhaust itself. So that, if the primacy of Abbot had been of much longer duration, matters would probably have relapsed into their former course¹.

The extreme and bitter anxiety with which the Bishop looked upon the condition both of Church and State, about this period, is manifested in his correspondence with Gerard Vossius. In January, 1629, he says,—“So may God love me, I know
1630. not what can be done, especially by myself, for the Church, in these festering times².” Again, in July, 1629, “Although I am unequal to the task of stilling the tempests by which the Church is tossed, yet you well know that, (with the blessing of God,) I will not be wanting to her cause, or my own duty. In the mean time, it is evident to all, how deeply the State must be perilled, while the Church is drifting³!” In the midst of all his cares, however, a fresh accession of honours now awaited him. On the 10th of

¹ Heylyn, p. 202, 203.

² “*His exulceratis temporibus.*” Præst. Vir. Epist. No. 460. p. 734. b.—No. 493. p. 758. b.

³ J. G. Voss. Epist. No 95. p. 74.

April, 1630, the office of Chancellor of the University of Oxford became vacant by the sudden death of William Earl of Pembroke. On the 12th, the Bishop of London was chosen to supply his place. In spite of some hasty opposition which was offered by the Calvinistic party, with the aid of the four Colleges¹ belonging to the Visitation of Dr. Williams, as Bishop of Lincoln, his election was carried with little difficulty. This unsolicited distinction must, doubtless, have been signally gratifying. The Bishop, nevertheless, was anxious to decline the burdensome and invidious honor. But his objections were overruled by his Majesty; who gladly and graciously approved of the appointment². On the 28th of April he was solemnly invested with the office. And the rest of his life shows how solicitous he was to justify the choice of the University, by his sleepless care for its prosperity, and by additional splendour of munificence in the encouragement of letters. In the course of another month, he received a further mark of the royal favour and regard. On the 29th of May, the Queen was safely delivered of a Prince, afterwards Charles the Second: and Laud "had the

¹ Baliol, Oriel, Lincoln, and Brazennose. It is affirmed by Prynne that Laud procured his election by foul play, in the scrutiny. (Cant. Doom. p. 71.) But this is mere fiction. It must have been next to impossible for Laud, or his "creatures", to concert any unfair measures. The Earl's death was quite sudden. Laud was in London at the time. And his election took place on the second day after.

² Laud expressly affirms that he was so far from seeking this honour, that he laboured, by his letters, for another: and that foreseeing the envy that would attach to the station, he begged permission to refuse it: but that the King would not suffer him. Troubles, &c. p. 305.

happiness to see him, before he was full one hour old¹." On the 27th of June, the royal infant was baptized by the Bishop, as Dean of the Chapel Royal²; the Archbishop, to whom the performance of the rite more properly belonged, being absent, either from infirmity, or from a feeling of alienation towards the Court. The event was hailed with joy, by all but the Puritanical party. Their hopes and affections were fixed on the family of the Queen of Bohemia, sister to their King. Her children, they said, were brought up in the Reformed Religion. But how could any man know what would be the religion of the King's children; seeing they were nurtured by a mother so devoted to the Church of Rome? And hence, while the rest of the kingdom was ringing with festivity, the Calvinists wore an aspect of almost funereal sorrow. Heylyn tells us that he was at a town in Gloucestershire, when the intelligence arrived; and that, in honour of it, the bells rang, and the bonfires blazed, and good cheer was distributed. But, all this time, "from the house of the Presbyterians there came neither man, nor child, nor wood, nor victuals: their doors being shut close, all the evening, as in a time of general mourning and disconsolation³."

The same year was, most unhappily, distinguished by the trial and punishment of the fanatical presby-

¹ Diary, p. 45.

² In the prayer used by Laud, on this occasion, were these words, "Double his Father's graces upon him, O Lord, *if that be possible*." This language might be injudicious and extravagant. But it hardly merits the bitter censure bestowed on it by Bishop Williams; who called it "three piled flattery, and loathsome divinity." Hacket, part. ii. p. 96.

³ Heylyn, p. 209.

terian, Alexander Leighton, by birth a Scot, by profession originally a physician, and father to the celebrated Archbishop of that name. During the last Session of Parliament, this man had published an inflammatory, and all but treasonable volume, which he was pleased to entitle "Zion's plea against the Prelates." In this work, which he dedicated to the Puritans, and presented in person to several members of the House, he exhorted the godly to smite the Bishops under the fifth rib, and to slay them; and branded the Queen as an idolatress, a Canaanite, and a daughter of Heth. In short, the language of the book was such as might be expected from a lunatic. It showed that the author was fitter for Bedlam, than the Fleet: and, in fact, the man died almost insane, in 1644. For this outrageous collection of libels, he was brought before the Star-chamber: and there, the two Chief Justices declared, that it was solely of his Majesty's mercy that he was not arraigned as a traitor, at another bar. It cannot be questioned that, although the writer was nearly a maniac, it was necessary to suppress, by a severe example, all such provocatives to murder and insurrection. But the punishment actually inflicted upon him, was horrible! And, it was not only an act of inhumanity, but a most egregious indiscretion. It, at once, converted a crazy rebel into a holy martyr. He was sentenced to imprisonment at the King's pleasure; to a fine of £10,000; to degradation from his ministry¹; to the loss of both his ears, and the slitting of his nose; and to branding on

¹ And yet this process must have been well nigh superfluous, in the estimation of Leighton's judges: for it does not appear that he received any other than Presbyterian ordination.

his forehead with the initial letters of the words *sedition* *slanderer*. After ten months' imprisonment, he was released by the Long Parliament; and, by way of compensation for his sufferings, he was made Keeper of Lambeth Palace,—then converted into Lambeth jail!

It is a remarkable circumstance, that this enormity was never laid to the charge of Laud, in the days when heaven and earth were ransacked for matter of impeachment against him. The repair of St. Paul's Cathedral—the setting up of some square feet of stained glass at Lambeth Palace—the rummaging of an old crucifix from among the *Regalia*,—all these worthless shreds and remnants of evidence his persecutors were not ashamed, in their contemptible exigency, to collect and patch together, in order “to make up a show” of plausible arraignment. But not one syllable occurs respecting the monstrous punishment of Leighton; though the man was then living, and doubtless ready to come forth, if he could have assisted to make good the charge. Prynne would have, almost, gone a pilgrimage to the world's end, to procure such proof against the *grand Inquisitor* of the Church of England! But Prynne himself was silent. It has, indeed, been since confidently affirmed that, while this merciless sentence was passing, Laud pulled off his cap, and gave God thanks for it. But this assertion was never heard of, till half a century after the death of Laud; and then, only on the authority of an anonymous pamphleteer, who assumed the name of Ludlow¹. If there had been any foundation

¹ This fact is asserted by Neale, vol. i. p. 548. 4to, 1754, but no authority is produced for it. It is, indeed, affirmed by

for the story, it is absolutely incredible that a fact like this should have escaped the notice of that watchful vengeance, which was seeking the Archbishop's life.

The next important passage in the life of Laud was the consecration of the Church of St. Catherine Cree, and several other Churches. 1631.

Peirce, in his *Vindiciæ*, that Laud was the author of all this barbarity : and this, upon the authority of *Ludlow*. See Peirce, p. 133—135, in the Latin copy, 1710, 8vo ; and p. 179—181, of the English Translation, second edition, London, 1718, 8vo. But, there is the strongest reason for believing that the " Letter of Ludlow to Dr. Hollingworth, 1692, 4to," (to which Peirce refers)—was not, in reality, the work of Ludlow. For Dr. Hollingworth, in his " Second Defence of Charles I." addresses the writer thus : " And now, sir, I come to examine your Letter itself. The title page is, *General Ludlow's Letter to Dr. Hollingworth*. Pray, sir, how durst you assume this name ? For we are not so ignorant who you are, as it may be you think we are." After this, appeared another Pamphlet, with the title, " Ludlow no Liar," also in 1692, in reply to Dr. Hollingworth's " Second Defence, &c." But it attempts no proof that the first Letter was genuine. So that, with regard to Laud's concern in " this barbarity," we have only the bare assertion of Neale, and of some unknown writer, who, in 1692, thought fit to disguise himself under the name of Ludlow.

Dr. Symmons, indeed, the editor of Milton, sagaciously discovers evidence of guilt, in the entry of this matter in the Archbishop's Diary ; and describes him as recording, " with calm rancour and cold-blooded exultation, the execution of these judicial barbarities." This is exquisitely ridiculous. The words of the Diary are, " Nov. 4th, Leighton was degraded by the High Commission.—Nov. 26. Part of his sentence was executed upon him, at Westminster." It might just as reasonably be concluded, from the Diary, that Laud *exulted* in the assassination of Buckingham, or the execution of Strafford. For he records them with just as much apparent coldness of blood, as the cropping

We may call it important, because the circumstances were, afterwards, produced to piece out the proof of his having traitorously endeavoured to subvert the true religion, by the introduction of Popish ceremonies. The Church of St. Catherine's had been recently rebuilt: and Laud's predecessor, Bishop Montaigne, had suffered it to be used for religious offices, without any fresh consecration. When Laud was advanced to the See of London, he suspended the celebration of all divine service in the Church, till it had been re-consecrated by himself. This office he performed on the 16th January, 1631, in the midst of a vast concourse of people. Every reader of English history knows that, on this occasion, the Bishop is supposed to have entered the west door of the Church with a pompous retinue; then to have thrown dust in the air, and to have uttered certain forms of execration against those who should violate the sanctity of the place; to have bowed repeatedly towards the altar, during the solemnity; and to have approached the sacred elements with antic gesticulations. In a word, he is charged with having followed the Romish Pontifical, instead of observing the simplicity appropriate to Protestant worship. His answer to this despicable charge, may be seen in his own history of his trial: and the statements of his enemies, when compared with his, are almost enough to make one

of Leighton's ears. The Diary, as Dr. Symmons must have known, contains little but a dry mention of facts; most commonly, without reflection or commentary. If Laud had lived to witness the murder of Charles I., it is probable that his Diary would not have been at all more pathetic, in the commemoration of that event.

ashamed of human nature. It turned out that the *pompous retinue* consisted only of the officials, who always attend at consecrations; that the throwing up of dust, and the uttering of curses, were pure fictions; and that the Pontifical supplied no more to the consecration service, than the Missal is known to have done to our Liturgy. He confesses that he approached the Church door with the words, *Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lift up ye everlasting doors, and the King of Glory shall come; a passage which had been used at consecrations, from time immemorial.* He further allows, that he pronounced the ground to be holy, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. And he contends that there is a *derivative* and *relative* holiness in places, as well as vessels, and other things, dedicated to the service and honour of God. He avers that he used no bowings (or *cringings*, as they were called,) but such as were demanded by the solemnity of the place and the occasion. And he added, “are we, who have separated the chaff, to cast away the corn, too? If it come to that, let us take heed that we fall not upon the *devil's winnowing*, who labours to beat down the corn. It is not the chaff that troubles him¹!”

From this statement it may be collected, that, even if the proceedings of the Bishop were, in any respect, open to objection, it was only in the introduction of some irregular and superfluous gestures. And to what extent, if any, this indiscretion was actually carried by him, it is far from easy to ascertain. We are told by Heylyn, that he was himself present,

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 339—341.

when Laud consecrated the Church of Stanmore, in Middlesex ; that he observed every particular of the service ; and that he could perceive nothing in it, which savoured of superstition. And he adds, that the form used by the Bishop had been digested by Bishop Andrews, and followed (though, possibly, not without some alterations) by most other Bishops, at that time¹. But Heylyn, it may be said, is a witness too partial to be trusted : and Rushworth has alleged, that the act of throwing dust in the air was established by the deposition of two witnesses. If so, the question arises, which are we to believe ; the solemn asseveration of Archbishop Laud, or the testimony marshalled and disciplined against him by the rabid and most unscrupulous malignity of William Prynne ? With regard to the manner in which he approached the bread and wine, on the Communion table, the averments of Laud are, undoubtedly, somewhat less explicit, than his denial of casting up the dust. But, even admitting, for a moment, the representation of his enemies, respecting this fact, to be correct ; the very worst which, in that case, could justly be urged against him, amounts to no more than this,—that he was betrayed into some transgression of the rigid letter of the ritual, partly by the fervour of his own devotional feelings, and partly by his disgust at that sordid slovenliness, which, of late years, had rendered the Protestant worship contemptible ; and which, be it always remembered, was driving multitudes back within the attraction of Romanism. The fanatics swaggered into the Church with their hats on, and frequently so

¹ Heylyn, p. 213.

remained, during the whole of the divine service. Laud, in his anxiety to correct their almost brutal irreverence, was desirous that they who entered a Church, should testify, by an obeisance directed towards its most hallowed spot, that they were conscious of treading within a precinct dedicated to the majesty of Heaven. The same feeling prompted him to give peculiar solemnity to the rite of consecration; the Puritans having maintained, that the sanctity of the place walked in, and walked out again, together with the congregation! In short, like many other wise and holy men, he apprehended that "religion would grow strangely wild, if it were left to the boisterous clowneries and unmannerly liberties" of those who, in the pride of their humility, trampled on the decorous appointments and ordinances of the Church. And, therefore it was, that he sought to discourage that pernicious humour, which was always ready to burst out into violent alarm, as if "every man went about to cut the throat of the Reformed Religion, who applied scissors, or razor, to pare off rudeness and rusticity, or to trim it into any decency of outward ministration." It is not, indeed, impossible, that his zeal, in these reforms, may have stepped, some few paces, beyond the boundaries of prudence. But what are we to think of a tribunal, which could aggravate an unusual act of adoring reverence into proof of a rooted affection for the mummeries of superstition; or discern, in any such light matters, a single element either of treason or apostacy?

CHAPTER V.

A.D. 1631—1634.

The purchase of Improvements by the Puritans—The Scheme overthrown by Laud—Repair of St. Paul's—Laud's benefactions to the University of Oxford—Theological disputes there—Laud unjustly charged with usurping patronage—He procures the appointment of well-affected men, to Dignities in the Church—The King's Printers fined for negligence—Sherfield censured for breaking a painted window—The King's visit to Scotland, and his Coronation there—Laud is elevated to the Primacy—His policy, as contrasted with that of his predecessor, Abbot—A Cardinal's Hat is offered to Laud—His refusal of it—He is elected Chancellor of Dublin—He revives the practice of requiring a title from Candidates for Holy Orders—This reform is resented as an innovation—Book of Sports—Conduct of Laud respecting it—Clamour of the Puritans against him—Laud's Metropolitanical Visitation—His power disputed by Bishop Williams—Williams's Jurisdiction suspended—Controversy respecting the Altar.

1631. AT the end of Bishop Laud's Diary, there is a list of useful and munificent designs, meditated by him, from time to time, to the number of one-and-twenty. Of this number, no less than sixteen were, wholly or partially, carried into execution by him; as we find intimated by the word "done," written against them. Among his successful purposes, the following is one: "To overthrow the *feoffment*, dangerous both to Church and State, going under the specious pretence of buying in impropriations.—Done."

In order to understand the nature of the project thus defeated, it will be necessary to go back, for a moment, to the year 1626. At that time, the person who exercised the most predominant influence among the Puritans, was one Dr. Preston. The national Church he regarded, at once, with the eye of a bitter fanatic, and an unprincipled spoiler. Towards the close of the last reign, he got the ear of Buckingham: and, not daring to propound the extirpation of Bishops, while James was living, he earnestly recommended to the favourite, the destruction of the Cathedrals and Collegiate Churches. The first and chiefest reason produced by him, for this sweeping confiscation, was, of course, the promotion of God's glory. The auxiliary motives were, that the produce would, not only pay his Majesty's debts, but afford the Duke himself abundant resources, for the enrichment of his friends, and the propitiation of his adversaries. Buckingham was, at first, quite transported with the proposal. And the plan would, very possibly, have been attempted, if it had not been put aside by the incomparable address and promptitude of Bishop Williams¹. It was during the ascendancy of this same man, Preston, that a design was formed among the Puritans, for the establishment of Lectureships in market towns; and, more especially, in those which were privileged to send Burgesses to Parliament. And one grand object was, to do this, at the least possible charge to the people; who, as Heylyn observes, "commonly

¹ A very interesting and entertaining account of this matter is given by Hacket in his *Life of Bishop Williams*, in which he calls Preston "a good crow to smell carrion," pt. i. p. 104, 105.

love that religion best, which comes cheapest to them." With this view, a sort of corporation was formed, for the purchase of impropriations; but without the authority of the King's Letters Patent, or of any Act of Parliament. The members of this body, to use the words of Fuller, "were four divines, to persuade men's consciences; four lawyers, to draw conveyances; and four citizens, to command rich coffers; wanting nothing but some sword-men, to defend all the rest." The work, however, had a most imposing show of generosity and godliness; and the sums contributed towards it were incredible.

It so happened, that Peter Heylyn (the biographer of Laud) in the course of his visits to a town in Gloucestershire, had observed that the impropriation of that place, under the new scheme, still remained in Lay hands; so that the Lecturer was, in fact, no better than a stipendiary, whose emoluments were precarious, and derived from the tithes of another parish. He further discovered that the man was a notorious nonconformist, who had been hunted from Diocese to Diocese, for irregular practices; and had, at last, been silenced by the High Commission. These circumstances engendered certain awkward suspicions: to which, on further inquiry, Heylyn (then Fellow of Magdalene) ventured to give very plain utterance, in a sermon before the University of Oxford, on the 11th of June, 1630. The confusion produced by this discourse is indescribable. The peaceable, well-meaning members of society deeply compassionated the rash and adventurous preacher. The Puritans, on the contrary, were filled with righteous indignation; and breathed out threatenings and the terrors of the law, against the evil-speaker.

The result was, that the sermon of Heylyn, and, with it, the whole merits of the case, were brought before the Bishop of London. And his Lordship's personal judgment on the affair, is recorded in the above recited entry of his Diary ¹.

From the investigation, upon which this resolution of Laud was grounded, it clearly appeared, that the incumbents of the parishes from which the impropriate tythes were respectively taken, derived little or no benefit from the fund of patronage accumulated by this corporation of feoffees, or purchasers; that the Lecturers, who were *hired*, not *endowed*, by that body, were persons notoriously disaffected to the discipline, if not the doctrine, of the Church of England; that the preachers were left entirely at the mercy of their patrons, and were, consequently, under the necessity of suiting their doctrine to the taste of their employers; that a considerable proportion of the fund was assigned to school-masters, and to students at the University; that another part was destined, not only to the support of silenced ministers, but of their wives and children after their decease; and that all this power was assumed by men who had formed themselves into a society, without any legal authority or sanction. The conclusion from all these premises, as expressed by Laud himself, was no other than this,—that the whole scheme was a crafty device, under a glorious pretence, for the overthrow of the church-government; by placing a large portion of the Clergy under a self-constituted body, in

¹ See Heylyn, p. 209—212. Fuller, b. xi. p. 136. 143. Troubles, &c. p. 371—374. Diary, p. 47. in which Laud says of the feoffees, that “they were the main instruments for the Puritan faction to undo the Church.”

a state of dependence much more absolute than could be imposed by the King, the Peers, and the Hierarchy together. Under this conviction, the Bishop of London never rested till the whole affair was submitted to the notice of Noye, the Attorney-General; and, by him brought before the Court of Exchequer. By the judgment of that Court the feoffment was overthrown in February, 1633; and the impropriations bought by the feoffees were confiscated to the crown. The criminal part of the charge against them was referred to the Star-chamber, but was never prosecuted further.

That Laud was no enemy to the recovery of impropriations, with a view to their rightful application, is manifest from the very next *item* upon his catalogue of projects,—namely, “To procure King Charles to give all the Impropriations yet remaining in the crown, within the realm of Ireland, to that poor Church.” And this design was afterwards accomplished, during the Vice-royalty of the Earl of Strafford. And, undoubtedly, it is much to be lamented that, when the feoffment in question was set aside, Laud did not adopt, upon a comprehensive scale, the wisdom of the enemies to the Church, and apply it to her benefit, upon sound and righteous principles. If the forfeited impropriations had been restored to the parishes to which they had originally belonged, and if the Bishop had immediately called upon those who loved the Church, to aid him, in the extension of a similar design to all the remaining impropriations in the kingdom, he might have rescued a vast number of incumbencies from beggary, and have conferred a lasting and inestimable blessing upon his country. But no one can reasonably be

surprised at his aversion for a project, which, if it were left to *have its perfect work*, would have constituted an *Apocryphal*¹ incorporation of rigid Calvinists and Nonconformists, the prime patrons in the kingdom; and would have reduced a considerable portion of the Clergy to a state of despicable thralldom. It was generally believed that, should the system continue in operation for fifty years, purchases, rather than money, would have been wanting: for it appears that, for the most part, the impropriations were bought in at twelve years' valuation; and, sometimes, at a still lower rate². Nevertheless, the efforts of Laud to protect the Church against this antagonist influence, afterwards supplied his accusers with one distinct article of impeachment, and his chief persecutor, Prynne, with much matter of turbid invective. The feoffment was extolled by them as a pious and godly work, which none but a devil incarnate could dislike. And no better motive could be found for the *malignant prelate's* opposition to it, but his impious hatred to a *preaching ministry*, and his desire to keep the souls of ignorant people in blindness, and the chains of Satan³.

It may easily be supposed that the resentment excited among the Puritanical party, by this interference with their plans, would be little assuaged by the munificence with which the Bishop was fostering the ancient institutions of the kingdom. A scheme of biography more diffuse than ours, would here call upon us for a detailed account of his splendid benefactions to the University of Oxford; and more

¹ So Fuller, tells us, it was called. *Ubi suprâ.*

² *Ibid.*

³ Troubles, &c. p. 371. Cant. Doom, p. 385—388.

especially to his own College, which he adorned with an additional quadrangle, and an elegant gallery. The first stone of this building was laid on the 26th of July, 1631. In 1635, it was completed, after a design by Inigo Jones, and at a cost of £5000¹. We must pass on to another enterprise, of greater magnitude, and more immediately connected with his office as Bishop of London,—the repair of St. Paul's Cathedral. When Laud was promoted to the Diocese, he found this vast edifice in a state of ruinous dilapidation. Some steps had been taken towards the preservation of it, in the course of the last reign: for, in 1620, a commission had been issued by King James, for the purpose of ascertaining the fittest means for raising money sufficient for its effectual repair. Unhappily, however, the Monarch was necessitous, the kingdom discontented, and Montaigne, (who succeeded Dr. King in the See of London,) though well-disposed, was lamentably deficient in activity. The business, accordingly, languished, until the advancement of Laud. With his usual energy, he applied himself to the task of wiping out this national reproach, and rescuing the sacred fabric from destruction. For this purpose, he procured a royal commission, under the Great Seal, bearing date the 10th of April, 1631, and addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Keeper, the Bishop of London, and several other Prelates, and certain Aldermen, and other officers of the city. By virtue of this Commission,

¹ This is Heylyn's account, p. 223. But Laud himself, in the History of his Chancellorship, has forborne to record what it cost him. See Archdeacon Todd, on the services of Laud to Literature. Trans. Roy. Soc. Lit. vol. ii. p. 208, 209.

collections were made throughout the kingdom ; Laud himself setting the example by an annual contribution of 100*l.* out of the revenues of the See. Such was the animation which he threw into the design, that the whole sum gathered in the course of the eight or nine following years, amounted to more than 100,000*l.*; of which, upwards of 10,000*l.* were given by the King. In 1640, the work was rapidly approaching to its completion. But then came the day of Laud's adversity ; and, from that time, all further progress was entirely suspended, and the building was left unfinished ¹.

The chief difficulty which he had to encounter, in the prosecution of his purpose, arose from the opposition of that party, who sickened at the very thought of ecclesiastical magnificence. They declaimed loudly against the folly of repairing and beautifying a *rotten relique*. They contended that the cause of godliness would be better served by the destruction of these monuments of superstition and strong-holds of idolatry. And some there were among them, who scrupled not to affirm that the whole project, from the beginning to the end of it, was a mere imposture ; a fraudulent contrivance of the court, to raise money for the King, without the aid of Parliament ; and, consequently, part of a design for investing the Monarch with arbitrary power, and making him wholly independent of his people. And such was the pertinacity with which these slanders were circulated, that it was found necessary to instruct the preachers at St. Paul's Cross, and at other public places both in town and country, to disabuse the

¹ Heylyn, p. 216—223.

public mind; and to declare that all apprehensions of a diversion of the money to any purpose but that for which it was collected, were "the fancies of men either grossly malevolent, or causelessly jealous and distrustful ¹."

But there was another cause of bitter discontent, which threw upon this noble work all the obloquy which could possibly be attached to a national abomination! The Archbishop was determined that the moral discipline of the Church should be something which men might feel, as well as speak of. And the consequence of this resolution was, that the profligacy of the wealthy and the great was dragged by him, to the light of day, before the High Commission Court; and, moreover, that a considerable portion of the pecuniary fines, which manifested their shame to the world, were thrown into that treasury, which was dedicated to the restoration of the Metropolitan Church of London. This was an insult never to be forgiven by the titled and privileged delinquents. The heat of their resentments was speedily communicated to the multitude; and at last, vented itself in the cry, that St. Paul's was built up with *the sins of the people*. It would seem as if the erection of St. Peter's, by means of Tetzels sale of Indulgences, was scarcely a viler profanation, in the judgment of many, than the repair of this Cathedral, out of the penal exactions upon incontinence and vice! Now, whether *the sins of the people* ought ever to be visited with pecuniary penalties, is a question which it is not needful to discuss. But, if it was the practice so to visit them, it would be difficult to imagine a more

¹ Heylyn, p. 221, 222.

righteous or beneficial appropriation of their produce. For, how could the wealth, which the laws withdrew from the coffers of profligacy, be better applied, than to the preservation of a venerable fabric, which, of itself, was a visible witness against all ungodliness? It was, indeed, suspected that the edge of ecclesiastical discipline was sharpened by the exigences of the work in hand; that the suppression of vice was the pretext, while the restoration of the Church was, in reality, the object; and that both the imposition, and the exaction of the fines, was much more rigorous than it would have been, if no such demand for them had then existed. But, after all, it does not appear that this was more than a suspicion. At all events, we are ignorant of the extent to which any such extortion was practised by the Censorial Court. It is certain, however, that the belief of it was sufficient, in those times, to aggravate the unpopularity of Laud, and to exasperate the public against his whole order¹.

The enemies of Laud, however, were not content with resistance to the reparation of the Cathedral. They, afterwards, forced the design into the service of his impeachment! Well might he exclaim "the repair of St. Paul's is a strange piece of *treason!*" And well might he add, "So God be pleased, (as I hope, in Christ, he will,) to pardon my other sins, I hope I shall be able (human frailties always set aside) to give an easy account of this." With equal justice might he cry out against the iniquity of laying to his charge the alleged losses of those persons, whose houses it was necessary to demolish, in order to rescue

¹ See Clar. vol. i. p. 166.

the sacred building from defacement, and to proceed with the restoration of it. It appears that the suffering parties had been indemnified to the amount of eight or nine thousand pounds; and that, besides his care and pains, the work had cost the Bishop himself twelve hundred pounds, out of his own purse. It is, also, undeniable that the whole of these proceedings had been regulated by the Council; at whose deliberations, relative to the demolition of premises near the Church, he was never once present. So that he might righteously ask, "Shall that be urged as a treason against me, which is not imputed to them, even as a misdemeanour¹?"

But it was, now, manifestly hopeless for Laud to attempt any good work, that should not be evil-spoken of by his adversaries. His elevation to the Chancellorship of Oxford, brought upon him, about this time, a fresh accumulation of obloquy and care. The seats of learning had been long invaded by the epidemic malady of insubordination; and the discipline of Oxford was, then, so deplorably in need of reform, that, according to the complaints which reached their Chancellor, there was danger lest all semblance of an University should be lost. It would be inconsistent with our undertaking to enumerate the various abuses and irregularities to which the Bishop applied the needful correction. It must not, however, be left unnoticed, that it was he who rescued the Royal Professorship of Hebrew from abject poverty. He found it, like the rest, endowed with a mere money payment of £40 per annum. He left it enriched, and ennobled, by the permanent annexation of a

¹ See Troubles, &c. p. 244—247. 413, 414.

Canonry of Christ Church: and for this service, he received the thanks of the University. Unfortunately, however, Oxford was then haunted by a spirit, which no kind or generous offices could pacify. And, on the 24th of May, 1631, that spirit spake, by the mouth of Thomas Hill, of Hart Hall, after the following fashion:—"Here," exclaimed the preacher, "what a tempting doth present itself, to show how rashly, not to say how cruelly, our *Pelagian* votaries have handled the decrees and statutes of the King of Heaven. Scripture they use worse than Turks do Christians at Tunis. They enslave it to the vassalage of the foulest error. According to their most current garb, they employ it to defend *Popery*, or, as bad, *Pelagianism*. *Popish* darts, whet afresh upon a *Dutch grindstone*, have pierced deep," &c. &c. The *Dutch grindstone* was, doubtless, that enemy of God, *Arminius*. The *Pelagians* were they who launched the shafts, to which the grindstone had given keenness. For this unbecoming and very stupid rhetoric, Hill was convened before the Vice-Chancellor and Heads; and compelled to a submissive recantation. This censure only produced a fresh eruption from the lips of three other sworn defenders of the "enslaved and ill-used Scriptures;" namely, Thomas Ford, William Hodges, and Giles Thorne. These men complained, in terms of furious invective, that the Church was deformed and overrun by *innovations*, under the treacherous disguise of *renovations*. Their very texts were provocatives to contention, almost to rebellion. *Let us make a Captain, and let us return into Egypt.—And he cried against the altar of the Lord, and said, O altar, altar, &c. &c.* So that the King's declaration against the Babel strife

of Pulpits, was not only forgotten, but audaciously defied. Nevertheless, when the turbulent declaimers were summoned before the Vice-Chancellor, they appealed to the Convocation : and, thereupon, the Vice-Chancellor appealed to the King. At the request of Laud, the whole matter was heard by his Majesty, in person, at Woodstock : when the contumacious preachers were expelled the University ; the Proctors deprived of their office for receiving their appeal ; and Wilkinson and Prideaux, who appear to have encouraged the contumacious parties, were dismissed with solemn censure and admonition.

The next year brought retaliation with it ; for one Rainsford was then summoned for defending the *Arminian* doctrine of *Universal Grace* ; and compelled to make a public acknowledgment of his fault, in discussing questions prohibited by the Royal Proclamation. But this impartial dealing did little to repress the fiery discontent of the Calvinising party. For in September, 1632, the University was infested with satirical verses, under the jingling title of the *Academical Army of Epidemical Arminians*, to the tune of the Soldier ; in which, several of the Arminian Divines were ridiculously paraded, with Laud for their general ! And one Rogers, of Jesus College, was expelled, on strong suspicion of being the author¹.

These miserable brawlings threw the whole University into confusion. Worthless as they are, for any other purposes of history, they are not altogether unimportant, as indications of the temper, which eventually convulsed the kingdom. They show the

¹ Diary, p. 46. Heylyn, p. 214, 215. Fuller, B. xi. p. 141, 142. Cant. Doom, p. 173—176.

manifold difficulties, which, at that critical period, embarrassed the government of the Church. They, further, make it evident, that the grand object of the odious Royal Declaration was, not so much the imperious correction of mere theological error, as the suppression of those inflammatory conflicts, which were then degrading the pulpits and the schools.

It was during the investigation at Woodstock, that Laud had the misfortune to furnish his adversaries with an additional item to their copious stock of calumny : for he chanced to let fall some expressions in the presence of the King, which were interpreted to the disparagement of the married Clergy ; and which, consequently, helped to confirm the belief, that the whole complexion of his opinions was essentially Popish. It is true that he himself remained unmarried to the end of his life : and, it is not improbable, that he might wish all other men in holy orders to remain so likewise. Indeed, the words actually used by him at Woodstock seemed to imply no less than this. In speaking of the incumbrance of domestic cares, as an impediment to the usefulness of a clergyman, he signified his resolution to prefer the single to the married, in the exercise of his patronage, supposing the fitness of the individuals to be, in other respects, the same. But, that he considered celibacy as indispensable in the Clergy, was an inference suggested only by the watchfulness of malice. He soon gave the best of all possible answers to this perversion, by marrying one of his own Chaplains, Thomas Turner, to a daughter of his intimate and valued friend, Sir Francis Windebank : and, by performing the ceremony himself, in his own

1632. chapel at London House, on Ash Wednesday, 1632¹. And this event was followed, on the 5th of June, by the appointment of Sir Francis, the bride's father, at Laud's recommendation, to succeed the Viscount Dorchester, lately deceased, in the office of Secretary-of-state².

At this time, scarcely any act could be done by the King, without furnishing matter of suspicion or accusation against Laud. For instance, a dispute having arisen between the Lord Keeper Coventry, and Lord Cottingham, Master of the Wards, relative to their rights of Church-patronage; the matter was referred to the decision of the King. His Majesty ordered that the sealing of the warrants for the contested benefices should remain with the Lord Keeper, until further inquiry could be made, with a view to the final settlement of the question: but, in the mean time, he reserved to himself the disposal of those benefices, in order that he might have some lesser preferments to bestow on such ministers as might serve as chaplains in the wars. The blame of this transaction was subsequently thrown upon the Bishop. He was charged on his trial, with usurping the patronage of the Master of the Wards: whereas, in fact, he never had the nomination to any one of these preferments; though the King, for the most part, consulted him in the disposal of them³. With

¹ Heylyn, p. 224.

² Diary, p. 47.

³ See Troubles, &c. p. 157. 368, 369. Heylyn, who never saw Laud's own History of his Trial, was probably misled by the false assertions of Prynne. For he says, "during the competition between the parties, Laud ends the difference, *by taking all to himself*. He takes occasion to inform his Majesty that, till the controversy were decided, he might do well to take those

respect to the higher honours of the Church, however, it cannot be denied that his influence was put forth, at this period, with a vigour and address which incensed his enemies in precisely the same degree that it tended to the depression of the Calvinistic theology and discipline. Nothing could well be more uninteresting than a list of preferments. It may, therefore, be sufficient to notice, that the individuals selected by Laud for promotion to the Bench, or other Dignities, were, for the most part, such as were branded by the Nonconformists, for notorious *Arminians*; and all of them were firm asserters of the Church's discipline and order. In other words, they were exactly the men who, in his estimation, were best fitted to co-operate with him in preserving the Church and State from ruin¹. Whether his judgment were right or wrong, may, probably, be questioned, to the end of time. But the motives which prompted his selection cannot rationally be disputed. The Church, as we have seen, was then infested by a multitude of lecturers, and was in imminent peril of a still further irruption: for the scheme of purchasing impropriations was not yet finally overthrown, but was still in existence and activity. It was, therefore, of immense importance that the most arduous posts in the Church should be committed to the hands of faithful men, who were prepared for a courageous encounter with the perils that surrounded her. Of course, the advancement of such men would mightily aggravate

livings to his own disposal. Which proposition being approved, his Majesty committed the said benefices to the disposal of the Bishop." Heylyn, p. 225.

¹ Their names are given by Heylyn.

the unpopularity of their patron. Nevertheless, he never could be made to repent of his choice, even in the darkest hour of his troubles. One charge against him, on his impeachment, was, his promotion of unworthy men, and semi-popish Arminians: "men so unworthy," he exclaims, "that they would be famous both for life and learning, in any other Protestant Church in Christendom:—men so popishly affected, that having suffered much, both in state and reputation, since this persecution began, (for less than persecution it hath not been,) no one of them is altered in judgment, or fallen into any liking with the Church of Rome ¹."

It is, now, scarcely possible to recite a single incident in the Bishop's life, which was not eventually turned to his reproach. In the time of his calamity, he was accused of tyrannical proceedings in the High Commission, against his Majesty's Printers, and Correctors of the Press. Such had been their negligence, that not less than a thousand errors were found, in two editions of the Bible and the Common Prayer; one of which was, the omission of the word *not* in the 20th chapter of Exodus, where the seventh commandment was thus exhibited: *Thou shalt commit adultery!* In consequence of this enormous blunder, the whole impression was called in; and the Masters of the Printing-house severely censured, and fined to the amount of 300*l*². It will scarcely be denied that their castigation was justly merited: and yet this circumstance was afterwards

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 366, &c. 417.

² Heylyn, p. 228. Troubles and Trial, &c. Trans. Royal Soc. Lit. vol. ii. p. 210, 211.

brought in, to swell the charge of treason against the Bishop. Malice itself, however, was unable to find fault with the disposal of the fine levied upon the delinquents; for, a considerable portion of it was applied for the purpose of enriching the press with a complete set of new Greek types. Again, in the Parish Church of St. Edmund's, at Salisbury, was a window of great antiquity, on which the Creation was storied out in painted glass,—the Father being represented in the form of an aged man. This mode of exhibiting the *Ancient of Days* was far from uncommon, in times of less intelligence and refinement. But in the year 1629, it happened to arrest the attention, and to awaken the wrath of Master Henry Sherfield, Recorder of Salisbury. This man, being consumed with zeal against all superstitious vanities, obtained an order of the Vestry for the removal of the window. And not content with this, when it was removed, he nearly battered it to pieces with his staff. For this sacrilegious outrage he was prosecuted in the Star-chamber; and in February, 1632, was fined a thousand pounds to the King, deprived of his Recordership, bound to his good behaviour, and ordered to make public acknowledgment of his offence, not only in the Parish Church, but also in the Cathedral, by way of atonement to his Diocesan, (Bishop Davenant,) for this open contempt of his authority.

The conduct of Laud, on this occasion, brought upon him a clamour which, as Heylyn observes, not only followed him to his death, but pursued his memory afterwards. The sentence, after the usual fashion of those times, was undoubtedly severe: and it is most certain, that not one syllable dropped from

See
the
way
the
works

Shame

food

But

the Bishop, which tended towards its mitigation. On the contrary, he maintained, with great warmth, that such an assumption of power by an individual was of most pernicious example, and that, if the image of Jupiter were placed in the Church, it could be properly removed, or demolished only by a legal course of proceedings. And, in this, he did but act conformably to the principles of his predecessor Abbot; who, when he opposed the restoration of the Crucifix at St. Paul's, in 1600, yet contended that such monuments ought, on no account, to be destroyed or altered, but by competent authority; and that, in this instance, an application should be made to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London¹. It was, further, observed by Laud, that, although the painting at Salisbury was not, in itself, defensible, it might, after all, have originated in nothing worse than a coarse and mistaken application of a passage in the Prophet Daniel². In this view of the subject, there was, at all events, nothing extravagantly Popish. But, nevertheless, it potently confirmed the belief, that Laud was, not only a merciless judge, but a resolute defender of all the worst absurdities of Romanism³.

1633.

From these comparatively obscure matters, we must turn to an event of much greater public importance. The year 1633 was remarkable for King Charles's first visit to his Northern dominions. The journey, it is well-known, from the

¹ Biogr. Brit. *Abbot*.

² "I beheld that the thrones were cast down, and the *Ancient of Days* did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool." Dan. vii. 9.

³ Heylyn, p. 228—230. Cant. Doom, p. 102, 103. 491.

histories of the times, was, on the whole, singularly inauspicious. It did but stir the elements, which afterwards burst forth with ungovernable fury. His Majesty arrived at Edinburgh on the 10th of June. On the 18th, the solemnity of his coronation was performed, at Holyrood House, with unusual pomp and magnificence; and, to judge from external demonstrations, never was a sovereign entertained with a more cordial welcome by his people. But, though all was bright at the Palace, the aspect of the Parliament was lowering. The nobles were secretly exasperated by the threatened revocation of those royal grants, by virtue of which they had long been revelling in the spoils of the Church. The people were agitated with fears, lest the visit of the King should portend the renewal of his father's hateful project, for the enforcement of conformity with the *Southern Church*. And their apprehensions were not much assuaged by the presence of Laud, or by his performance of divine service in the Chapel Royal, according to the formularies of the English Liturgy. It is true, that the sermon delivered by him, on that occasion, was listened to with much apparent complacency and approbation; although it urgently recommended the adoption of the same ritual throughout his Majesty's dominions. It soon appeared, however, that this was a very fallacious symptom of the public feeling. It encouraged the King to propose a bill for ratifying and confirming the act, which had conferred on James an unlimited power of regulating the habits of Churchmen. The attempt succeeded for the time; but as it were, *through the fire*. And so great was the indignation of the defeated but powerful minority, by whom it was opposed, that,

from that moment, the King became an object of suspicion to his discontented subjects ; and his counsels were watched by them with incessant and sleepless jealousy. Their resentment at the above proceeding was aggravated by the establishment of Edinburgh as a new Episcopal See ; a measure which was spoken of, as a national grievance, and as indicating no less than the projected introduction of Romish superstition, and arbitrary power¹. As if to fill up the measure of the general alienation, the Scottish Prelates were elevated to the highest secular dignities. The Archbishop of St. Andrews was invested with the office of Chancellor of the Kingdom, and several of the other Bishops were made Privy Counsellors, or Lords of Session. By this expedient the King was in hopes of redeeming the heads of the Church from contempt, and of repairing the loss of reverence, which they had sustained by the reduction of their ecclesiastical influence and power. Nothing could well be more complete than the failure of this design. It filled the whole nobility of the realm with envy and indignation, and surrounded the Bishops themselves with enemies and spies. The discontent, however, though deep, was not loud ; so that the King retired from Scotland in a dream of complacency and satisfaction ; believing that he had but to seize a favourable moment for the introduction of a Liturgy into his Northern dominions².

It was generally surmised that his Majesty was principally guided by the counsels of the Bishop of

¹ Heylyn, p. 235—241. Russell's Hist. of the Church of Scotland, vol. ii. p. 117—119.

² Clarendon, vol. i. p. 146—156.

London, in all the measures which related to the Scottish Church; and, more especially, in the accumulation of honours upon spiritual men. There were some substantial grounds for this suspicion, in the principle notoriously entertained by Laud, that nothing tended so effectually to the benefit and security of the Church, as the advancement of Churchmen to places of high trust in the State¹. That he was in the fullest enjoyment of the royal confidence, speedily became more manifest than ever. Soon after the King's return, Archbishop Abbot breathed his last, in the 71st year of his age. It was pretty generally understood that the King would not have to deliberate for an instant, as to the appointment of his successor. And accordingly, the first time that Laud appeared at Court, after the death of Abbot, the resolution of his Majesty was signified by the gracious address—"My Lord's grace of Canterbury; you are very welcome." By the 19th of the following September, his translation was formally completed, and was celebrated by him with a stately and solemn banquet, at Lambeth Palace². At the same time he procured the promotion of his trusty friend and fellow collegian, Dr. William Juxon, to succeed him in the Diocese of London³.

The post to which Laud was now elevated was one of tremendous difficulty and peril. His predecessor at London House had been the passive and indolent Bishop Montaigne. At Lambeth he succeeded a Prelate, who is known to have brought with him to the Primacy a rooted attachment to the theology of

¹ Clarendon, vol. i. p. 152.

² Heylyn, p. 250, 251.

³ Clarendon.

Geneva; and who, it has been suspected, had no very decided aversion for her discipline. At all events, if he loved the Church of England well, it is probable that he loved Calvinism better. On the death of Archbishop Bancroft, it had been the wish of many among the best friends of the Church, that he should be succeeded by the incomparable Bishop Andrews. But the influence of the Earl of Dunbar prevailed: and Abbot, who had once been Chaplain to that nobleman, was accordingly elevated to the See of Canterbury. One favourite principle of his government was liberality and moderation towards the men whose consciences were afflicted by the ordinances and ceremonies of the Church. And we are told, that he was accustomed to give expression to this principle by the maxim, "Yield, and they will be pleased at last;" while Laud, on succeeding him, instantly threw himself into the breach, with the directly opposite aphorism, "Resolve, for there is no end of yielding." That Abbot's administration, however, was uniformly deficient in firmness, has sometimes been asserted with more confidence than the evidence would appear to warrant. It cannot be denied that he estimated very highly the usefulness and the dignity of the High Commission Court; that he resolutely maintained its authority; and that he manfully resisted the attempt to cripple it by writs of Prohibition from Westminster Hall¹. It is, nevertheless, certain, on the other hand, that he was almost the idol of that party who were incessantly complaining of the iron yoke of conformity. They

¹ Biogr. Brit. *Abbot*.—Rushw. vol. i. p. 453, &c.

seemed willing to pardon his severities¹, from the persuasion that his heart was with them, even when his office compelled him to raise his hand against them. They knew that, like themselves, he esteemed an unqualified abhorrence of Popery, and of its ricketty and ill-favoured progeny, Arminianism, to be of the very essence of all pure religion. And they further plainly saw, that he was by no means disinclined to throw the gates of the Church wide open to a tumultuary garrison of Lecturers and Preachers, many of them animated by a fanatical abhorrence of what they called the *Antichristian* doctrine of General Redemption; and some among them, scornfully impatient of Canonical restraint, and inflamed by a rancorous spirit of sedition. His personal demeanour was grave and solemn; but, not unfrequently, austere and supercilious. His life and conversation were, in all essential respects, without reproach. But, unless he has been grievously misrepresented, there must have been something wilful and eccentric in his humour. He is reported, for instance, to have looked with an eye of coldness, almost of unkindness and aversion, upon the humbler brethren of his own profession, and to have princi-

¹ That Abbot could be severe, may be concluded from the fact alleged by Laud at his trial, that the suspensions, deprivations, &c. inflicted by the High Commission, during the primacy of Abbot, were rather more frequent than in the time of Laud. *Troubles*, p. 164. It also appears, from an account of his Province, given by Abbot to Charles I., that Nonconformity had been vigorously and successfully repressed. See the vol. of *Laud's Troubles*, p. 519. One of the last acts of Abbot was to order the parishioners of Crayford, in Kent, to receive the Sacrament on their knees.—*Regist. Abb. fol. 123.* cited in *Biogr. Brit.—Abbot.*

pally affected the society of laymen¹. This has been, in part, ascribed to the peculiar circumstances of his life. It has been said of him, that he first crept, then run, then flew into preferment: his first step of promotion having been to a Lectureship; his second to a Diocese; his third to the province of Canterbury². So that he never knew the difficulties and privations incident so frequently to a parochial cure; and, therefore, had scarcely one feeling in common with the inferior Clergy. According to the statement of some, towards the close of his days, the habit of moroseness grew upon him, together with his infirmities; his house became the resort of men who were *bitter of heart* towards both Church and State; and his visitors were known by the name of *Nicodemites*, because they usually assembled in his chamber by night³. These, however, are assertions which must be very cautiously received. They may, not improbably, have originated in the jealousy of the Duke of Buckingham; who would, doubtless, have gladly seen the gates of Lambeth Palace closed against every man who was not slavishly devoted to his interests⁴.

¹ Lloyd, in his *State Worthies*, tells us, that, in his house, Abbot respected his Secretary above his Chaplains; and that, out of it, he honoured cloaks above cassocks. ² *Ibid.*

³ Fuller's *Ch. Hist.* b. xi. p. 128.

⁴ See *Rushw.* vol. i. p. 450, where Abbot says that he "gave friendly entertainment to all of civil sorts; not sifting what objections the Duke might make against them." He, moreover, declares that his house was watched for suspicious characters; and that Wentworth was among them.

The difficulty of forming a perfectly satisfactory and impartial estimate of Abbot's character and administration, will be perceived by any one, who will consult the *Biographia Britannica*,

It must here be mentioned, that the very earliest effect of Laud's advancement, was to call into activity the arts and practices of the court of Rome. Without a moment's delay, the Jesuits were busy in their vocation. For we learn that the remains of Abbot were scarcely cold, when some person, now unknown, waited upon his intended successor with the insidious offer of a Cardinal's hat; seriously averring that he had ability to give effect to the proposal. The offer was evidently one, which, whether refused or accepted, would sufficiently answer the purposes of its authors. If accepted, it would convert their formidable enemy into a firm ally; and, even if refused, it might help to ruin him, by engendering a suspicion that he was in secret correspondence with the Vatican. The proposal was first made on the 4th of August. On the 17th of the same month, it was repeated. And, on both occasions, it was met by Laud with the same answer; that "somewhat dwelt within him, which would not suffer that, until Rome were other than it is." His Majesty was, of course, made acquainted with the mysterious affair: and, after the second refusal, the tempter appeared no more¹.

The Puritans, for a time, were somewhat less active than the emissaries of the Papacy. For upwards of twenty years, indeed, they had been look-

and the authorities there referred to. See, also, Fuller's Ch. Hist. b. xi. p. 128; Clarend. vol. i. p. 156—158, 167, 168; Abbot, in Lloyd's State Worthies. It is observed by Lloyd, that if Laud had succeeded Bancroft, there would have been good hope that our Jerusalem had been at unity with herself.

¹ Heylyn, p. 252, 253. Diary, p. 49. Some further remarks on this strange occurrence are reserved for the ninth Chapter.

ing towards Lambeth with complacency and hope; and they, now, secretly scowled upon it, as the strong-hold of iniquity and ungodliness. But the promotion of Laud to Canterbury, had been so long foreseen, that their hatred did not show itself by a fresh eruption of any consequence. We find, indeed, that, shortly after his translation, Lady Davies, a notoriously eccentric personage, prophesied against him, that he would not long outlive the 5th of November; that one Richard Boyer was brought into the Star-chamber for grossly railing at him, and charging him with treason; and also, that a needy and half-lunatic printer, named Green, was committed to Newgate, for coming into the court at St. James's with a sword by his side, swearing that the King should do him justice against the Archbishop, or that, else, he would take a different course: although the only wrong the man had ever sustained, was, that Laud had procured him a pension of five pounds a year for his life, from the Company of Stationers¹. These matters were too trifling to disturb his tranquillity, for a moment. Nevertheless, that the difficulties of his position would, at times, weigh heavily upon his spirits, is evident, from his correspondence with Wentworth, then Lord Deputy of Ireland. On the 9th of September, in answer to Strafford's congratulations on his late advancement, he expresses himself thus: "To speak freely, you may easily promise more than I can perform. For, as for the Church, it is so bound up in the forms of the common law, that it is not possible for me, or for any man, to do that which he would,

¹ Diary, p. 49.

or is bound to do. They which have gotten so much power, in and over the Church, will not let go their hold. *They* have, indeed, *fangs* with a witness; whatsoever I have once said to have. And, for the *State*, I am for *thorough*. But I see that both thick and thin stays *somebody*, where I conceive it should not. In truth, I have had a heaviness upon me ever since I was nominated to this place: and I can give no account of it, unless it proceed from an apprehension that more is expected from me, than the craziness of the times will give me leave to do¹." Again, on the 14th of October, we find him writing as follows, respecting his former, and his present bishopric: "I must confess my weakness, that, having been married to a very troublesome and unquiet wife before, I should be so ill-advised as now, *being above sixty years of age*, to marry another, of a more wayward and troublesome generation²!"

If honours "broad and deep," however, could perfectly reconcile a man to these great responsibilities, Laud must now have been completely at his ease. He received the cordial and respectful congratulations of the University of Oxford; and, afterwards, those of several of the most illustrious scholars of Europe³. On the 14th of September, he was elected

¹ Strafford's Letters, &c. vol. i. p. 110. Ed. Knowler. The word *thorough* seems to have been a favourite phrase with Strafford and Laud. It occurs perpetually in their correspondence; and evidently indicates their belief that no *half-measures* were suited to the times.

² Strafford's Letters, &c. vol. i. p. 124.

³ J. G. Vossius to Laud, Præst. Vir. Epist. No. 519, p. 772. *b.* Grotii Epist. No. 772, p. 130. *b.*

Chancellor of the University of Dublin¹. And being thus invested with the primacy of England, placed at the head of two of the famous Universities of the realm, and admitted to the unreserved confidence of his Sovereign, it might be truly said of him that he was "without a rival in Church or State². That his courage was equal to his greatness, is evident from the tone of his correspondence. "I am resolved," he says to Strafford, "to go steadily in the way which you have formerly seen me go. So that, if any thing fail of my hearty desires for the King's and the Church's service, the fault shall not be mine³." With similar confidence he writes to Vossius: "I well know the virulence of those who assail my reputation, with their poison-fangs. But such enemies must be disregarded; or nothing will be ever done for the benefit of the Church. I hope that God will give me constancy and patience: and I heartily desire that you will commend me to His protection, by your prayers. Thus fortified, I will go forward, whithersoever He shall lead me⁴."

The first measure of the Archbishop was, the revival of an unpopular, but strictly canonical⁵, regulation, that no person should receive holy orders, without a *title*; in other words; without some specific

¹ Diary, p. 50.

² Clarendon, vol. i. p. 162.

³ Straff. Lett. vol. i. p. 155.

⁴ Præst. Vir. Epist. No. 528, p. 786 b.

⁵ By Canon 33 (Anno 1603,) no person can be admitted to sacred orders, without a presentation to some ecclesiastical preferment, or without being provided of some Church with cure of souls; or of a fellowship or chaplaincy in a college, sufficient for his maintenance.

appointment, or employment, in the Church, which would supply him with a maintenance. That this rule was conformable to the general practice of the Church, is beyond all question. That it is eminently wise and salutary, is evinced by the general adherence to it, which has been continued to the present day. At the time of Laud's advancement, its usefulness had received a negative, but irresistible proof, in the miserable consequences of the long neglect of it. It had never been enforced by Abbot: and the result was just what might be expected. The Church was overrun by a vast multitude of indigent clerks, wholly unprovided with any regular support. And these clerical adventurers were, at all times, ready to thrust themselves into gentlemen's houses, as tutors to their children, "and sometimes to officiate divine service at the table's end;" sometimes to undertake itinerant and other lectureships; and, not unfrequently, to become the heralds of fanaticism and sedition, at the will of their Puritanical patrons, on whom they were often entirely and most abjectly dependent. The steady application of the rule in question, by the predecessors of Laud, might doubtless have prevented measureless confusion; and protected the Church against the influx of an irregular and undisciplined force, whose operations were dangerous to her order and stability. Unhappily, the long disuse of this measure gave to the revival of it, by Laud, the ungracious aspect of an arbitrary *innovation*. It was reprobated, as a fresh instance of the Archbishop's enmity to all genuine godliness, and of his restless passion for the luxury of despotism. One chief ground of this furious and vindictive clamour, is now evident as the light. The regulation was

fatal to the principle of popular election, and mere stipendiary maintenance; those vital elements of nonconformity, and banes to the respectability and *true* independence of the clergy. Laud, however, was moved by none of these things. So long as his influence predominated, the evil nearly disappeared; so that, to use the words of Heylyn, "from henceforth we hear but little of such vagrant ministers, and trencher-chaplains, (the old brood being once worn out,) as had heretofore pestered and annoyed the Church¹."

The letter addressed by Laud to his suffragans, for the enforcement of the above order, was dated on the 18th of October. On the very same day went forth his Majesty's well-known declaration respecting the lawfulness of Sunday sports. This was the beginning of fresh unpopularity and trouble to the Archbishop. It will be recollected by every reader of the history of those times, that a "Book of Sports" had been published by King James, in which his Majesty maintained that certain recreations were not unlawful on the Sabbath. He was tempted to this dangerous experiment, by his desire to compose the strife, which then was becoming vehement, between the spirit of fanatical austerity, on one hand, and the festive propensities of his people, on the other. The success of his endeavours to settle the question, was far from satisfactory. The Royal Manifesto was considered, by the stricter Protestants, as a dangerous concession to the Romanists, and a virtual surrender of all scriptural views, relative to the sanctity of the day of rest. It is not improbable, however, that the controversy

¹ Heylyn, p. 253—255.

might have slept, during the present reign, if it had not been revived by one Theophilus Bradburn, a Clergyman and Schoolmaster in Suffolk; who, in 1628, put forth a book, in which he maintained the moral and perpetual obligation of the *Jewish sabbath*; and contended that it was no better than *will-worship*, to make the observance of the *Lord's day* binding by virtue of the fourth commandment. This work he was rash enough to dedicate to the King: and his recompense was a prosecution in the High Commission, which brought him to a speedy acknowledgment of his error. It was, nevertheless, thought advisable that Dr. White, then Bradburn's Diocesan, should draw up a refutation of these extravagant opinions. The doctor's notions, however, were, in some respects, too lax to find much favour in the eyes of the more rigorous religionists. Hereupon, says Fuller, books begat books; and the controversy was becoming intricate, and apparently interminable¹. In the mean time, certain magistrates, in various

¹ Any discussion of the merits of this question would be incompatible with our limits. A good account of the prevalent opinions, may be found in Fuller. The *Sabbatarians* generally maintained the principles of Bradburn. The *Anti-Sabbatarians* "unhinged the day from off any *Divine right*, and hung it merely on ecclesiastical authority." The *moderate men* grounded the observance of *one day in seven*, "on the moral equity of the fourth commandment; which" they said "was like the feet and toes of Nebuchadnezzar's image, part of potters' clay, and part of iron. The clay part, and ceremonial moiety of the commandment, (namely the observance of the *seventh day*) was mouldered away, and buried in Christ's grave. The iron part thereof (namely, a mixture of morality therein, *one day in seven*,) was perpetual and everlasting." Fuller, Ch. Hist. b. xi. p. 144—149. And these are, pretty nearly, the views of the *moderate men*, at the present day.

parts of the country, who had adopted the more austere principles, had taken upon themselves to restrain, by vexatious regulations, not only the enjoyment of festivities and sports, but the exercise of needful occupations, on the Lord's day. In 1631, their severity was openly sanctioned by the injudicious zeal of Richardson, then Chief Justice of the King's Bench. At the Lent Assizes for the county of Somerset, in that year, he had published certain intolerable prohibitions, accompanied with an order to the parochial clergy, for promulgation of them from the desk. This was represented by Laud, (then Bishop of London,) to the King, as an encroachment upon the ecclesiastical jurisdiction: and, thereupon, Richardson was immediately commanded to revoke his order at the next Assizes. When the Assizes came, Richardson, instead of obeying the royal injunction, republished his regulations in a still more peremptory form. Indignant at this contempt of his authority, his Majesty required the Bishop of London to ascertain, from his brother of Bath and Wells, the manner in which all feast-days, and wakes, and revels, were celebrated in his diocese. A certificate was speedily returned by the Bishop, signed by seventy-two of his clergy, decidedly favourable to the continuance of such practices. Upon this, the Judge was summoned before the council, and positively commanded to reverse his former orders. The ungracious office of reproof for his contumacy should, undoubtedly, have been left to the other members of the Board. Unhappily, however, the impetuous temper of Laud disabled him from perceiving how unseemly a spectacle it would be, for the Chief Justice of England to stand and hear his condemnation

from the mouth of a Bishop. And he, accordingly, took upon himself to administer so stern a rebuke, that Richardson came out, exclaiming "that he had been almost choked with a pair of lawn-sleeves¹!"

It was in hopes of terminating this contest, and of relieving himself from the torrents of petitions which were pouring in from the opposite parties, that the King resolved to interfere. He, accordingly, gave orders to the Archbishop, that the declaration of lawful sports should be reprinted, word for word, as it had issued from the press in the time of his father, in 1618. To this document he subjoined his own ratification; in which he signified his royal pleasure that wakes and other feasts should be observed,—that the Justices of Assize, and other magistrates, should protect the people, in their lawful recreations, provided they had first attended to the religious duties of the day,—and, lastly, that the Bishops should take order for the publication of his command, throughout all the parish Churches of their respective dioceses.

The appearance of this declaration was the signal for a general outcry from the more rigorous Sabbatarians. No better names could be found for it, than a profane edict,—a toleration for dishonouring the Lord's Day,—an unhallowed sacrifice of God's glory to the power of the King. As usual, the main burden of the obloquy fell upon the Archbishop. The measure was imputed wholly to his evil counsels; and was, afterwards, stigmatized by Burton as the first great exploit achieved by him, for the suppression of godliness, after he had taken possession of his *graceship*². Of course, it grew, in due time, into an item of impeachment for treason. At his trial, he was charged with labouring to put a badge of holi-

¹ Heylyn, p. 255—257.

² Ibid. p. 255—261.

ness upon places, and take it away from days ; and with encouraging Sunday recreations, for the purpose of extinguishing the ordinance of preaching. To all this he replied, that he acted by the express command of the King,—that none but *lawful* recreations were allowed—and that the lawfulness of certain sports and pastimes, on the Sabbath day, was acknowledged even in the practice of Geneva ; where, after Evening Prayer, the elder were allowed to bowl, and the younger to engage in manly exercises. He was further accused of rigorous proceedings against certain ministers, for refusing or neglecting to publish the declaration in their Churches. But it appears that no case of undue severity could be substantiated ; and that, on the contrary, he had executed the King's orders with considerate lenity, more especially within his own peculiar diocese¹. This circumstance, however, was carefully attributed by his adversaries to the very worst motives that perverse ingenuity could discover. They ascribed it, says Fuller, not to his charity, but his policy ; and affirmed that, all this while, he was preying, like the fox, furthest from his own den ; and instigating other Bishops to greater activity, than he would be seen to exercise himself². Of this most malicious imputation it can only be said, that no proof was ever produced in support of it ; and that nothing could be more opposite than such vile cunning, to the directness and intrepidity which usually marked the proceedings of the Archbishop, whether they were right or wrong. At all events, his worst enemies were unable to deny, that, whatever might be his zeal against the *Sabbatarians*, the Lord's day

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 343—346.

² Fuller, b. xi. p. 148.

was always most religiously honoured by him, in his own person.

With regard to the Declaration itself, it is now generally admitted to have been, at best, inexpedient and unwise. In the first place, perhaps no subject can be named, which more powerfully exposes the impotence of mere law-giving, or proclamation, than the observance of the Sabbath day¹. The regulations prescribed will, most probably, err, either on the side of laxity or of vigour. And, even if they should be framed with the most consummate wisdom, scarcely any human authority would be sufficient for their effectual and permanent enforcement. Besides, it can scarcely be denied that the official promulgation of an indulgent system is liable to a two-fold objection: it may, practically, invite the licentious to abuse and excess; and it may discourage and scandalize the worthiest and most religious members of a Christian community.

At the beginning of the year 1634, the Archbishop resolved upon a Metropolitan ^{1634.} Visitation of the whole province of Canterbury; in other words, upon a course of warfare against the manifold indecencies and abominations which, for a

¹ It might, nevertheless, be well that our lawgivers should deeply ponder the following words of Fuller: "We in England are concerned now more strictly to observe the Lord's day than ever before. Holy Days are not; and Holy Eves are not; and Wednesday and Friday Litanies are not. And now, some out of error, and others out of profaneness, go about to take away the Lord's day also. All these things are against God's solemn and public service. O let not his public worship, now contracted to fewer channels, have also a shallower stream!" Fuller b. xi. p. 149.

long period, had disfigured the Church. One of his first cares was, for the due position of the Sacramental Table, and for its protection from irreverence and desecration. It has already appeared, that, from the moment of his first promotion, this had always held a foremost place in his thoughts: and it has been conceived by many that it occupied a disproportionate share of his attention. In order to estimate his conduct rightly, it will be proper to take into consideration the consequences which had resulted from a neglect of this department of ecclesiastical discipline. In the Cathedral Churches, then, and in the Chapels of the nobility, that, which we now scruple not to call the *Altar*, was usually placed, *where we now uniformly see it*, close to the Eastern wall of the Church; guarded by a decent railing from defilement and profanation. In many of the Parochial Churches the case was widely different. It was dragged, by Puritanical scruple or caprice, into the body of the Church, and treated as if no peculiar sanctity belonged to it. It often served the Churchwardens for a parish-table, the school-boys for a desk, and the carpenters for a working-board. In one place, we are told, a dog had run away with the bread set apart for the Holy Communion; and, in many instances, the wine had been brought to the *table* in pint-pots, and bottles, and so was distributed to the people¹. Such were the effects of an indiscriminate aversion for the practices of Rome! It can hardly be thought surprising that any man, whose mind was rich in the knowledge of Christian antiquity, and whose heart was warm with zeal for the glory of God,

¹ Heylyn, p. 285.

should look upon these base and slovenly usages with loathing and indignation ; more especially when it was found that, by such practices, the Reformed profession was identified with positive impiety, in the estimation of the most sincere and sober-minded Romanists.

The Archbishop felt it to be his duty to attempt a reform of these unseemly abuses. And when he was, finally, called upon to answer for his proceedings, he solemnly averred that his motive was not a stupid attachment to Popish mummeries, but solely a desire for the restoration of external and visible Religion¹. Of course, he had much resistance to encounter when he undertook the task ; and the opposition was rendered more formidable and more vexatious by the aid and countenance of Bishop Williams. That Williams had no serious objection to the ancient practice of the Church, is manifest from the facts, that the Table occupied the place, contended for by the Archbishop, in his own Cathedral of Lincoln ; in the Abbey Church at Westminster, of which he was Dean ; and in his private chapel at Buckden-palace : and further, that he had, himself, prevailed on the inhabitants of St. Martin's, at Leicester, to place their Communion Table in a similar position. Nevertheless, on a representation from the Vicar, Churchwardens, and others of that same parish, he issued letters, in December, 1633, granting them permission to bring the Table back to its former situation in the body of the Church. And this he did, in spite of an Order in Council to the contrary effect, made with reference to the Parish

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 150.

Church of St. Gregory's, in St. Paul's Churchyard; which order was dated only in the preceding November¹.

The Archbishop considered this proceeding of Williams as little less than a signal of hostility. He therefore resolved to make the Diocese of Lincoln the scene of his first Visitation; and to inhibit the Bishop and his Archdeacons from the exercise of their jurisdiction, so long as the Visitation lasted. Williams was not one of those who yield tamely to a first assault. He contended that his own jurisdiction had been exempted from such suspension, by certain Bulls obtained from Pope Innocent the fourth, on the procurement of Bishop Grosthead: and he moreover insisted that the threatened inhibition would operate ruinously to himself, by diverting the fees and procurations, which then formed the chief source of the Bishop's maintenance². Laud was, at first, somewhat staggered by this remonstrance. But, on a further investigation of his own rights, he determined to have the question argued before the Lords of the Council. The claim of the Archbishop was established by their decision. His Visitation accordingly proceeded, and the Churchwardens throughout the Diocese were ordered to transpose the Table to the East end of the Chancel, and to fence it with a proper railing. But although Williams was thus, for a moment, overthrown, he touched the earth only to rise up from it with unabated vigour. The instant he was relieved from the suspension, he visited his

¹ Heylyn, p. 259, 260. 285—287.

² Williams's Letter to the Archbishop, on this subject, may be seen in Hacket, pt. ii. p. 98, 99.

Diocese in person. On meeting with Dr. Bret, a grave and reverend man, but of the school of Geneva, he accosted him with the gracious words of St. Augustine, "Although a Bishop is greater than a Presbyter, yet is Augustine inferior to Jerome¹;" thus gratifying the Puritans with a confession that Bret was as much greater than Williams, as a Bishop is above a Presbyter. And, still further to win them, he gave order for placing the Communion Table in the middle of the Church, with a rail *about* it; and not at the east end, with a rail *before* it².

This encounter between the Archbishop and his former rival, tended, of course, to widen the breach between them. Williams lived to taste the luxury of retribution. If the powers of the Diocesan of Lincoln were suspended, for a time, by Laud, the favour was amply repaid, in after days, by the Archbishop of *York*. For, Williams was the man, who, subsequently to his promotion to that dignity, instigated the Lords to inflict the sequestration of his jurisdiction upon the Primate of all England! The more immediate result of the present conflict, was a series of learned controversial writings between the Bishop of Lincoln, and Dr. Heylyn, (the biographer of Laud,) which our limits forbid us to notice in detail, and which, at the present day, would be almost entirely destitute of interest³. But, surely, without the as-

¹ *Quamvis Episcopus major est Presbytero, Augustinus tamen minor est Hieronymo.*

² Heylyn, p. 286, 287.

³ Williams had thrown together his thoughts upon the question, in the form of a "letter to the Vicar of Grantham," so long before as 1627. The visitation of 1634 tempted Heylyn to publish this letter, together with an answer, under the title of "A

sistance of much profound erudition, the essential merits of the case may be summed up in very few words. That the Sacramental *table* should be protected from profanation, will not, for a moment, be disputed. Whether it should be called a *table*, or an altar, became a matter of comparatively trifling importance, when once the Sacramental *doctrine* had been brought back to its original simplicity. Its position in the Church would be fitly regulated, partly by considerations of convenience, but chiefly by a reference to the practice of primitive antiquity. In the earliest ages, beyond all question, its situation was at the eastern end of the Church. And, whatever might be its appropriate position, nothing but confusion could be the effect of leaving the matter to be decided by the caprice of ministers, who might be ignorant of ecclesiastical history; or of Churchwardens, who were often ignorant of every thing, their own secular trade and mystery excepted.

Coal from the Altar." Williams replied, in 1637, by a treatise entitled the "Holy Table, name and thing, &c." And Heylyn rejoined by his "*Antidotum Lincolnense.*" The Bishop was preparing for his further vindication, when he was prevented by his troubles in the Star-chamber, in consequence of which his library was seized. "And how" says Hacket "could he fight without his arms? Or, how could the bell ring, when they had stolen away the clapper?" Those who may be curious about the whole history of this contest, will find it in Hacket, pt. ii. p. 99—109. It may be observed that Hacket ascribes Laud's earnestness about this, and similar matters, to nothing worse than an *excess of piety*; ὑπερβολὴ τῆς εὐσεβείας. p. 100.

CHAPTER VI.

A.D. 1634—1637.

Laud endeavours to bring the foreign Protestant Churches to conformity with the Church of England—He labours to improve the condition of the London Clergy—He obtains from the Crown the restitution of Irish Impropriations—The Church of Ireland is brought to conformity with the Church of England—Laud is made a Commissioner of the Treasury—He resigns the office, and procures the appointment for Juxon—He proceeds with his Metropolitan Visitation—Enforces the repair of Cathedrals, and other reforms—He is unjustly suspected of countenancing the Popish designs of the Queen—He establishes his right to visit the Universities—He obtains for Oxford a new body of Statutes, and the Caroline Charter—He is accused of aiming at the office of Universal Lawgiver—His charity and munificence—They cry against him as a persecutor—He entertains the King and Queen at Oxford—Punishment of Prynne, Bastwicke and Burton—Laud's vindication of himself from the charge of bringing back Popery, &c.—He is assailed with virulent libels—Prosecution of Bishop Williams.

AMONG the arbitrary acts imputed to Laud, was his attempt to force upon the foreign Protestant Churches, in this country, the Liturgy and discipline of the Church of England. A full history of the proceedings adopted by him, for the accomplishment of this purpose, would occupy a much larger space than the limits of our undertaking will allow. It may, however, be practicable to put the reader distinctly in possession of his views and motives, without any burdensome profusion of detail.

In the first place, then, when Laud was Bishop of

London, his attention had been attracted to the discreditable irregularities which had long prevailed among the English factories and regiments, beyond the seas. It would appear that our Chaplains and Ministers abroad had almost, if not altogether, forgotten that they were clergymen of the Church of England. The worship of God was, for the most part, conducted by them conformably to the fashion of Geneva. The state of the foreign congregations in England was equally unsatisfactory. All thoughts of compliance with the Anglican Formularies had long been lain aside by the French and Walloon Churches settled in various parts of England. And such was their tone of independence, that, in 1632, the Bishop thought it advisable to submit their doings, as well as those of the English settlements in foreign parts, to the attention of the Council; and moreover, to draw up certain stringent regulations for their correction¹. It was not, however, till his advancement to the primacy, that Laud began to grapple closely with these disorders. His first measure was, to procure an order of Council, dated October 1, 1633, by which the English Churches and military Chaplaincies, in Holland, were enjoined to a strict observance of the English Liturgy, with all the rites and ceremonies prescribed by it. And similar instructions were, soon after, despatched to all the English factories, and embassies², in every part of

¹ Heylyn, p. 231—235.

² It appears, from a story told by Lord Leicester, that Laud was unwilling that our Ambassadors in France should attend the Protestant service at Charenton. And this has been considered as indicating his Popish inclinations. The truth, however, is, that Laud was anxious that the King's ministers abroad

the world. The next care of the Archbishop was to reclaim the French and Dutch congregations settled in England. In the prosecution of his purpose, he began with his own diocese; and, in April, 1634, addressed certain questions to the French Church at Canterbury, and to the Dutch Churches at Maidstone and Sandwich. One of these questions was, whether such of them as were *born subjects* would conform to the Church of England? The congregations were refractory; and pleaded the exemptions and privileges granted them by King Edward VI., and confirmed by subsequent acts of Council, in the reigns of Elizabeth, King James, and his present Majesty. The Archbishop was, notwithstanding, inflexible. It was, of course, well known to him that Letters Patent had been granted by Henry VIII. to John Alsaco, and his congregation of strangers. But it was also known that these same congregations were utterly broken up in the time of Queen Mary; and that their privileges departed with them. He, likewise, recollected,—though the congregations seem to have forgotten it,—that the policy of Elizabeth, with reference to the foreign Churches, was distinctly recorded in a letter of hers to the Lord Treasurer Pawlet, signed with her own hand, in the second year of her reign; in which she signifies her pleasure, that the Church of Augustine Friars should be delivered to the Bishop of London, for the use of strangers resorting to the city; and that such ministers as he might approve, should be appointed to those Churches; but “so as

should be attended by Chaplains, faithful to the Church of England, instead of joining the Calvinistic and Presbyterian worship of the Huguenots. See Blencowe’s Sydney Papers. Note (A.) p. 261. &c.

no rite nor use be therein observed, contrary or derogatory to her laws¹." With this memorial of "the wisdom of those times" before him, the Archbishop persevered. And, after some contentious negotiation, it was ordained, that those ministers, and others, of the French and Dutch congregations, who were not native subjects of the King, should be allowed to use their own discipline as before ; but that, nevertheless, the English Liturgy should be translated into French and Dutch, in order that the children of the foreigners should be brought up in the Communion of the Church of England. It was further ordered, that, in future, none but strangers should be admitted as ministers in those congregations : and, that the Natives should be bound to make collections for the maintenance of their own ministry, and the poor of their own Church. This last injunction was added, to pacify the apprehensions which had arisen, lest these proceedings should so far have the effect of *naturalising* the congregations, as to entitle their poor to relief out of the parish rates².

These proceedings were not forgotten, in the Archbishop's impeachment ; one article of which, though not much insisted upon, charged him with *traitorously* suppressing the immunities of the foreign Churches. His measures, were, doubtless, alien from *our* principles of toleration. In his time, however, those principles were unknown to any party whatever : and to him it appeared insufferable that these congregations should be living, as he expressed it, on his trial, like "a kind of God's Israel in Egypt," till they became "a Church within a Church, and a State

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 166, 167.

² Heylyn, p. 276—280.

within a State ¹;" to the great danger and dishonour of that hospitable Church to which they, originally, fled from persecution. That he was not singular in these views, is manifest from the opinion of his adversary, Bishop Williams; who, in general, was notoriously disinclined to measures of severity against the non-conformists; but who, yet, was impelled by the example of these very communities, to dissuade King James from the introduction of a colony of Bohemian Protestants ². And, that the fraternities in question were, in truth, little better than nurseries of disaffection, was sufficiently obvious, from the fact, that they were encouraged in their resistance by the English puritans; and animated with prodigal assurances, that the liberty of the Gospel, and the deliverance of the Church of England from episcopal tyranny, depended chiefly on their firmness and resolution ³.

Besides, in an estimate of this, and of all the measures of Laud, it would be unjust to forget his ardent love for the Church of England; his passionate persuasion that she was framed, more nearly than any other, according to the model of Apostolic sanctity and purity; and his earnest, though chime-

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 165.

² "These Dutch and French," says Williams, "brought a commodious manufacture into the realm. But they brought a discipline with it, which was a *suffocation* to the temperate *Crisis* of our own Church government. Which peril of distemper would be increased by the access of the Bohemic congregation." "A great forecast (Hacket observes), to keep our hierarchy sound from the contagion of foreigners. He (Williams) was more religious, to keep the Church of England in its sabbath, and holy rest, than to help out the neighbour's ox, that was fallen into the pit." Hacket, pt. i. p. 96.

³ Heylyn, p. 280, 281.

rical, desire, that her discipline and worship should be spread throughout all Christendom. In the estimation of his enemies, indeed, this warmth of attachment was among the blackest of his enormities. In this propensity, as in almost every word, and deed, and look, and gesture of his, they saw nothing but symptoms of a rooted aversion for the Reformed Faith, and a settled design for its final overthrow¹.

There was another project, of more vital importance, which had long been near to the heart of Laud; and to the accomplishment of which, he earnestly addressed himself about this time; namely, an improvement in the condition of the London Clergy². It would occupy us too long to enter into the history of the claim of the city incumbents to the payment of two shillings and nine pence in the pound, upon the rents of houses, under an order, or decree to that effect, made in the reign of Henry VIII., and, subsequently, confirmed by Acts of Parliament. It may suffice to state, that, in the interval between those times, and the days of Laud, this order had never been openly disputed. On the contrary, the perfect legality of the demand was, virtually, acknowledged, by the very artifices resorted to for the purpose of evading it. It would be sick-

¹ It is remarkable, that, although the above transactions furnished, eventually, matter of crimination against Laud, the charge was suffered to drop, when his trial came on. The silence of his persecutors as to this Article, he himself attributes, in part, to their dread of being confronted with the formidable letter of Queen Elizabeth to the Lord Pawlet.—Troubles, &c.

² It is mentioned, among the designs contemplated by him, at the end of his Diary: "To see the tythes of London settled between the Clergy and the City."

ening to enumerate the despicably fraudulent contrivances, by which the city landlords conspired to cheat the clergy of their rights. Their ingenuity was as successful as it was infamous. The London ministers were reduced by it to a state of such miserable indigence, that, in 1618, they sought redress in the Court of Exchequer. In vain, however, did the Judges declare, that the payment ordered by the Act was to be upon the *true* yearly value of the premises. In vain did the Bishops exclaim that the artifices of the landlords were iniquitous and sacrilegious. There was no contending with the purse of the city of London. The cause of the clergy became more and more desperate, from year to year; till, at length, they were driven to cast themselves at the feet of King Charles, and to supplicate for the redress of oppressions, which were becoming insupportable. His Majesty, without delay, referred their petition to the consideration of the Archbishop, and other commissioners; whose inquiries were conducted in a manner which promised better days to the unfortunate ministers. Their hopes were considerably brightened by the appointment of Bishop Juxon to the office of Lord Treasurer, in March, 1636. And, possibly, the labours of the Primate and his colleagues might have ended in some equitable and satisfactory adjustment, if the troubles which had long been gathering had not interrupted this work of righteousness and charity¹.

It is scarcely credible, though it is absolutely certain, that the exertions of the Archbishop, on behalf of his starving and defrauded brethren, were after-

¹ Heylyn, p. 281—285.

wards numbered among the ingredients of his *treasonable* guiltiness. "The business of the tythes of London," he tells us, "was raised up in judgment against him." No attempt, however, was made to fix, upon any step of his proceedings, the charge of illegality. Only one witness appeared: and that one witness had nothing worse to say of him than that he "pressed the matter much and often:" which the Archbishop freely admitted to be true¹. That his activity was as bad as treason, in the estimation of his accusers, may, indeed, be easily imagined. For, in the first place, as Heylyn tells us, there were men, in those days, who deemed that £2000 a year was scarcely enough for an alderman; but that £100 a year was rather too much for a minister. But avarice was not the only passion which helped to stamp Laud as a traitor, on account of his zeal in the cause of the parochial clergy. The lust of dominion had some considerable share in getting up the accusation. For, in proportion as the established local clergy were depressed, the lecturers were sure to be had in honour, or, at least, in request; and the lecturers were a race dependent wholly on the caprices of the people, or on the purses of the wealthier citizens. An independent clergy was a sight, that neither the disaffected populace, or citizens, could easily endure to look upon².

Before we proceed further in the history of Laud's administration of the Church, in England, it will be proper to notice the invaluable services rendered by him to the sister Church, in Ireland. It is utterly

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 251.

² Heylyn, p. 282. Is there any thing new beneath the sun?

impossible to describe, in few words, the miserable condition of the Irish Church, at that period. They who would form any adequate notion of it, should, by all means, peruse the correspondence of the Archbishop with Wentworth, when the latter held the office of Lord Deputy; from which, it appears that spoliation, sacrilege, and criminal neglect, had done their worst upon it. The attention of Laud had been called to this afflicting subject, some years before, by a report from the admirable Bishop Bedel; and, at length, on the suggestion of Primate Usher, he resolved to obtain, if possible, from the King, a restitution of all the Irish impropriations which had not been granted by the Crown to laymen. The time was fearfully unpromising for such an application. The Exchequer was almost empty, and the necessities of the King urgent. Such, however, was Charles's warm devotion to the interests of religion, that he readily assented to the proposal. The plan was as heartily speeded as the Archbishop could desire, by the energies of Wentworth: and, thus, a considerable fragment of her revenues was restored to that dilapidated Church¹.

¹ Strafford's Letters, vol. i. p. 81, &c. &c. Ed. Knowler, 1739. Life of Bishop Bedel.—Heylyn, p. 268, 269.

The following may be taken as a general expression of the honest zeal with which Wentworth prosecuted the redress of the plundered Church: "Just at this present, I am informed that my Lord Clanricarde hath engrossed as many parsonages and vicarages, as he has mortgaged for £4000, and £80 rent. But, in faith, have at him, and all the rest of the *Ravens*. If I spare a man of them, let no man ever spare me. Howbeit, I foresee, this is so universal a disease, that I shall incur a number of men's displeasure, of the best rank among them. But were I not better lose these, for God Almighty's cause, than lose Him

It is almost needless to state that this, like almost every other public act of Laud, was afterwards voted to be *traitorous*. It was said to intimate a design for the abolition of *all* impropriations; and, *therefore*, was evidence of a desire to usurp no less than a Papal power: and it was treasonable to the King, inasmuch as it amounted to “a robbing of the Crown.” The foregoing brief narrative contains, in effect, the answer actually given by Laud to these ridiculous imputations. The proposition, he says, had originated with the Lord Primate. It had been communicated to the great officers of the Exchequer. The matter had been patiently considered. The free consent of the King had been obtained. So much for “robbing of the Crown.” But then,—as Laud continues,—“The increase of Popery is complained of in Ireland. Is there a better way to hinder this growth, than to place an able Clergy among the inhabitants? Can an able Clergy be had without means? Is any means fitter than impropriations restored? My Lords, I did this, as holding it the best means to keep down Popery, and to advance the Protestant religion. And I wish, with all my heart, I had been able to do it sooner, before so many impropriations were gotten from the Crown into private hands¹.”

In September, 1633, the connexion between the Archbishop and the Church of Ireland had become more intimate, in consequence of his election to the Chancellorship of the University of Dublin. It appears from his correspondence with the Lord Deputy, for theirs?—Strafford's Letters, &c. vol. i. p. 298. August 23, 1634.

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 297, 298.

that he had accepted this honour with deep reluctance. It had been his wish, that Wentworth himself should occupy that important post; on the ground, that his commanding influence, and his presence on the spot, would render him the most effectual guardian of that learned body. Nevertheless, when once elected, Laud applied himself, with his usual vigour, to the duties of the office thus cast upon him; and, eventually, procured for the College a new Charter, together with a Code of Statutes for its better government¹. He also felt himself engaged, by his closer relation to the University, to a more vigilant care for the honour of the Established Protestant religion. At that period, the doctrines of the Church of England seemed to be sinking fast into contempt and oblivion. Little was there heard of, but the turbulent strife between Popery and Calvinism. The vigour of Wentworth, however, succeeded, for a season, in putting a bridle in the jaws, and hook in the nostrils of Popery. It now remained for him to tame the spirit of her sullen antagonist, and thus to prepare for the firm establishment of the Anglican faith and discipline. The task was one which demanded all his resolution and dexterity. It happened, unfortunately, that Primate Usher, admirable and eminent as he was in many respects, was somewhat defective in that strength of purpose, which is required for great public emergencies. Besides, he was still tainted with those Calvinistic principles, under the influence of which, before his advancement to the Primacy, he had co-operated towards the introduction of those Articles of religion, for the Irish

¹ See the end of the Diary.

Church, which had passed in the Convocation of 1615. These Articles, it is well-known, were conceived in a widely different spirit from those of the Church of England; and, the effect of this was, that the two Churches exhibited the spectacle, not of sisterly concord, but of unseemly and quarrelsome dissension; and that both of them became the objects of bitter scorn to the adherents of Rome. It was, therefore, of the highest importance to the peace and honour of both, that the Church of Ireland should be won over from her Calvinistic Articles, and prevailed on to receive those of England in their stead.

The process by which this was effected would require a lengthened narrative. We must be content to state that the purposes of Wentworth and of Laud (who acted together, with entire harmony, throughout the whole course of these transactions) were finally accomplished, in the Convocation held at Dublin, in 1634; at which, the English Articles and Canons were received, in their full integrity; and the two national Churches were brought into a state of entire conformity with each other¹.

1635. In February, 1635, a strangely anomalous distinction was conferred on Laud. The Primate of all England was made a Member of the Committee of Trade. By this appointment, however unpopular it might be, the King, at least, secured one good and faithful servant to watch over the improvement of his revenue. In the March following, he was

¹ Heylyn, p. 269—274. See also a long and very interesting Letter of Wentworth to Laud, December 16, 1634, containing a full account of this matter: from which it appears how much the cause in hand was indebted to the address and firmness of the Lord Deputy. *Straff. Lett.* vol. i. p. 342.

named one of the Commissioners of the Treasury, on the decease of the Earl of Portland¹; and, thus, he was unfortunately plunged into a labyrinth of secular business, and brought into perpetual collision with the selfish designs and passions of men less honest than himself. His zeal for the service of his royal master impelled him to set his face, like a rock, against the sordid machinations of those who sought nothing but their own profit; whether such persons were to be found in high places or in low. The same motive occasionally betrayed him into the encouragement of projects, which greater knowledge and experience would have led him to condemn; but which the want of all regular resources, and the suspension of Parliament, seemed, at that period, to render all but unavoidable. It is no subject of wonder, that the Archbishop soon became weary of the toil and vexation of an office, which only surrounded him with enemies at Court; and aggravated the malice of all, throughout the country, who were already disposed to look upon him with an evil eye². He was relieved from the burden in the following year. On the 6th of March, 1636, at his recommendation, and to his unspeakable satisfaction, Juxon, Bishop of London, was promoted to the post of Lord High Treasurer. The Archbishop was strangely blind to the tendency of this appointment. He remarks, indeed, in his Diary, that no Churchman had held this office, since the time of Henry VII.; a circumstance which, alone, might have awakened him to the danger of bestowing it upon a Bishop, after

¹ Diary, p. 51.

² Clarendon, vol. i. p. 173—176. Oxf. ed.

so long an interval, and in a state of society so widely different. But the warning was, unfortunately, lost upon him. He prayed for God's blessing on the choice, "that the Church might have honour, and the state service and contentment by it. And, now," he added, "if the Church will not hold up themselves, under God, I can do no more ¹."

These very words were produced against the Archbishop, at his trial, among other evidence, in support of the general charge, that he had traitorously assumed a tyrannical power in temporal as well as in ecclesiastical matters. He replied, very justly, that he could perceive neither treason, nor any other crime, in what he had done or written. The accusation, however, must have satisfied him,—though unhappily, too late—that the time was gone by, in which ecclesiastics could prominently interfere, with dignity or safety, in the management of secular affairs. At the period of this appointment, his unpopularity had nearly reached its height. "Whatsoever were the cause," Clarendon continues, "this excellent man, from the time of his promotion to the Archbishopric, or rather, from that of his being Commissioner of the Treasury, exceedingly provoked, and underwent the envy, reproach, and malice of men of all qualities and conditions, who agreed in nothing else. All which, though well enough known to him, was not enough considered by him, who believed (as most men did) the government to be so firmly settled, that it could be shaken neither from within nor without; and that less than a general confusion of law and gospel could not hurt him. Which was

¹ See Diary, p. 53.

true, too : but he did not foresee how easily that confusion might be brought to pass ; as it proved shortly to be ¹.”

In the prosecution of his ecclesiastical duties, the Archbishop, this year, proceeded with the Metropolitcal visitation, which he had commenced in 1634. The irregularities which called for redress, were manifold ; and the spirit of resistance to reform, was still active in many parts of the country. The removal of the Communion-table to the upper end of the Chancel, more especially, was a cause of bitter discontent. In the first place, the *new* practice, as it was called, was, in many instances, unavoidably attended with some expense ; and this alone was sufficient to render it unpopular. Connected with this subject, was the manner of celebrating the Eucharist. And here, again, was a further complaint of *innovation* ². The gesture and the posture furnished inexhaustible matter of controversy : and the paper war was carried on “ with the same earnestness, and contention for victory, as if the life of Christianity had been at stake.” In the midst of all this strife, the Archbishop remained firm to his purpose. He was conscious that his only motive was an ardent zeal for the service of God. He, likewise, knew that the charge of *innovation* was altogether groundless. He contended for nothing which had not the sanction of primitive usage, and of the Canons and

¹ Clarendon, vol. i. p. 180, 181.

² This, says Clarendon, was an unlucky word, and cozened very many honest men into apprehensions extremely injurious to the King and the Church. The writings of Bishop Williams on the Communion-table, helped to give it this dangerous currency. Clar. vol. i. p. 171.

Constitutions of the Church. And, so far, he was blameless and unassailable. It was thought, however, by many who esteemed and honoured him, that his correction of the existing disorders was considerably too precipitate; and that he would have done well to recollect, that the restoration and maintenance of the spirit of conformity, was a work which then demanded, not only great firmness of purpose, but more than ordinary patience and address¹. His difficulties were augmented by the conflicting opinions of many of his Bishops. Besides those who conscientiously seconded his views, there were others who were bound to him, either by gratitude or hope; and these, accordingly, were active in the furtherance of his reforms; and in some instances, even injured his cause by a passionate excess of zeal. Others again, smaller in number, and less in reputation, who were not attached to him by obligation or expectancy, were content to render a languid and unsteady assistance to his plans. They touched the burden with their little fingers; and were not displeased to see the main pressure of it resting upon the shoulders of the Primate².

¹ From one of his own Reports to the King, respecting the state of his Province, it would appear that he himself was not always unmindful of the necessity for caution and moderation. See the volume containing his Troubles, &c. p. 543.

² This is Clarendon's representation of the case; and he may be quite safely followed, when he bears a *qualified* testimony to the merits of Laud. A more detailed account of these transactions, may be found in Heylyn and in Hacket; both of whom, however, must be consulted with some caution: for they, each of them, write too much in the spirit of advocates and partizans.

Another most important care which fell upon the Archbishop, was the restoration of the Cathedrals to a fit condition for the due and becoming celebration of Divine Worship. They were, most of them, in a state which indicated a long period of irreverent neglect. The Archbishop resolved to begin the work of reformation in his own glorious Cathedral. His first injunction was, that appropriate furniture should be provided for the solemnity of the Eucharist. And in order that this might be no transient regulation, he compiled a complete body of statutes for the government of the Church, with his own hand signed to every separate leaf, and despatched it to the Chapter under the authority of the Great Seal : and one of the enactments was, that every Prebendary, at his entrance into the Choir, and departure from it, should bow towards the Altar, and so make due reverence to Almighty God. A similar code was prepared by him for the Cathedrals of Winchester and Hereford. In various other Cathedrals, he found that the Chapters had been more careful of their own emoluments than of the repair and decoration of the fabric. And, with the aid of Bishops Davenant and Morton, such effectual measures were taken for the correction of these abuses, that the Cathedral Churches began to recover something of their ancient dignity and splendour, and to serve for an example to the Churches connected with them¹. That many of the parochial edifices had long been in need of some such influence to preserve them from ruin, is undeniable. Of this, one instance may be mentioned, as illustrating the feelings with which such profa-

¹ Heylyn, p. 291—294.

nation was contemplated by Laud. At a visitation held by him, when he was Bishop of London, the preacher at St. Peter's, Cornhill, derived the word *Diaconus* from *κόνις* (*dust*); as if the title were significant of the *dust* and heat of a laborious life. "I am sorry," said the Bishop, afterwards, in his charge, "to find here so true an etymology. Here is *dust*, and dirt too, enough for a Deacon, or a Priest, to work in; dust of the worst kind, from the ruins of this ancient House of God¹!" But of all the monuments of neglect which Abbot had left behind him, the Chapel of his own palace at Lambeth was, perhaps, the most disgraceful. When first Laud came to reside there, he could never enter it without disgust. It was a scene of filth, disorder, and decay. Among other deformities, the painted windows were in some places broken to pieces; and, in many, they were miserably patched with the most ordinary glass; so that, as Laud avers, they had the appearance of a beggar's coat². This state of things was not suffered by him to continue long. The whole Chapel was properly repaired. The windows were restored and beautified, as nearly as might be, according to the original design. The Communion-table was removed from the middle of the Chapel, fenced with a costly railing, and decorated with a suitable canopy. Plate and other furniture were provided for the Sacramental Service. Copes (which at that time were not wholly disused) were supplied for the use of the officiating Chaplains. The broken and tuneless organ was fitted up: till at length the

¹ Lloyd's Memoirs, p. 232. Ed. 1668.

² Troubles, p. 311.

whole place wore an aspect no longer dishonourable to the worship of God. The example of the Archbishop was not lost upon his own University; and the College Chapels at Oxford gradually shook themselves from the dust¹.

In the principles which dictated these improvements there is surely nothing for intelligent and sober-minded men to reprove. In these days, it is difficult for us to imagine the perverseness which then revolted against the spectacle of decent solemnity—nay, of common cleanliness,—in the public services of Christian devotion. If Laud's proceedings, relative to such matters, were Popish, then are we, of the Reformed Establishment of England, now living in the midst of an almost complete apparatus of Popery; for our Cathedrals and our Churches are, for the most part, in a condition which Laud himself might have looked upon with complacency. In those times, however, a reverence towards the Altar was often thought to indicate a firm belief that Christ was corporeally present in the Sacrament of the Altar: and, in every painted window, was read no less than a design to subvert the true religion, and to set up Romish, or even semi-pagan, idolatry in its stead. Besides, the outcry against the Romish practices and propensities of Laud was conspicuously serviceable to the destructive political faction of the day. It kept the people in a state of perpetual irritation and alarm. It prepared them for the most desperate extremities against the Church, as the strong hold of superstition,—and against the State, as bound up with the Church in a dangerous and unhal-

¹ Heylyn, p. 294.

lowed alliance. And hence it was, that the exertions of Laud, for the revival of outward decency of worship, not only raised much angry murmuring at the time, but were placed nearly in the front of that evidence which was to stamp him as a traitor to his country, and an apostate from the Reformation¹.

There occurs in the diary of Laud, in the course of this year, an entry, which, combined with two others, (the one 1634, and the other in 1639,) have contributed to fix upon him the suspicion of a perfidious compliance with the designs of the Queen. On the 11th of May, 1635, he writes as follows: "Whitsun Monday, at Greenwich—My account to the Queen put off till Trinity Sunday, May 24; then given her by myself. And assurance of all that was desired by me, &c." On the 30th of August in the preceding year, 1634, we find a similar memorandum. "At Oatlands, the Queen sent for me, and gave me thanks for a business, with which she trusted me. Her promise, then, that she would be my friend, and that I should have immediate access to her, when I had occasion." The guilt implied in these dark sentences was supposed to be placed beyond all doubt, by a subsequent confession of the diary: "April 3, 1639, Wednesday—Before the King's going, (to the North,) I settled with him a great business with the Queen; which, I understood, she would never move for her-

¹ They who are desirous of seeing all the abuse and persecution suffered by the Archbishop, for these matters, must endure the penance of looking into the tiresome pages of Prynne. Cant. Doom. p. 462, &c. &c. They must, also, consult Laud's History of his Troubles, &c. c. xxxi. xxxii. p. 306, 307—310.; where they will, also, find his own irrefragable vindication of himself.

self. The Queen gave me great thanks. And this day I waited purposely upon her, to give her thanks for her gracious acceptance. She was pleased to be very free with me, and to promise me freedom." Nothing can be well more obscure than these fragments. Heylyn, who was much in the confidence of the Archbishop, confesses himself at a loss for any satisfactory explanation of them: but conjectures that they may have some reference to the suspicious mission of Panzani, an agent of the Pope, who had been dispatched to England for the ostensible purpose of composing certain dissensions between the regulars and the secular Priests, who were eternally quarrelling with each other. It was well known that her Majesty was anxious for the safe and honorable reception of Panzani: but, that her conferences with Laud related to this, or to any other matter connected with religion, has been positively denied by the Archbishop himself. "As for religion,"—he observes, on his trial, "as there is no word of it in my Diary, *so neither was it, at this time, thought on.* But, it seems, it must be a crime, if I be but civil and dutiful to the Queen, though it be but thrice mentioned in so many years¹." Our belief in the sincerity of this denial, is strongly warranted by an entry in the Diary, on the 22nd October, 1637; in which he speaks of himself as having incurred her Majesty's displeasure, by the freedom with which he had spoken, at the council, of the intrigues of certain Romanists about the Court. The adversaries of Laud were, nevertheless, resolved that he should be held up to scorn as "an instrument of the Queen's."

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 382, 383.

1636. And, in aid of the judgment pronounced upon him by his own journal, they insisted loudly on the instructions issued by him, on his Metropolitan Visitation, in 1636; by which he inhibited public prayers for her conversion. Every one can now perceive, that this interdict was nothing more than what was required by the spirit of the marriage articles, which protected her Majesty in the free exercise and profession of her own religion: and which would have been egregiously violated by exposing her to public insult from every fanatical preacher in the realm, who might choose to libel her, in the form of a supplication for the health of her soul. In those times, however, the prohibition was considered as an irresistible evidence of two things; first, that "they who framed and issued it would never attempt, by prayers, or conferences, or otherwise, to rescue her Majesty from error; and, secondly, that they *must* certainly have regarded the Popish Religion as true, and our own religion as false¹."

The earliest transaction, in the year 1636, of any moment in the life of Laud, was the decision of a question, to which the spirit of the times gave some importance. The Archbishop was then proceeding with his Metropolitan Visitation; and finding that there still prevailed at Cambridge some disorderly practices which needed correction, he thought it expedient to extend the exercise of his authority to that learned body. This attempt was vigorously resisted by the University, as an encroachment upon their ancient privileges; by which, as they contended, they were exempt from all visitation but that of the King. They were supported in their opposition by their

¹ See Cant Doom, p. 418, 419.

Chancellor, the Earl of Holland : and it was found necessary to refer the matter to his Majesty's decision. The case was, accordingly, argued before him, in council, at Hampton Court, on the 21st of June, in this year ; and judgment was given in favour of the right of the Archbishop¹. The actual exercise of this power was, however, prevented by the gathering difficulties of the time. But the mere name and rumour of it was not without its effect. The College Chapels, and other places of worship, began to assume a more orderly and becoming aspect ; and, even at St. Mary's, (the University Church,) the Communion-table was speedily railed in, and was occasionally honoured by a reverent obeisance towards it²."

It would seem that this measure was resented by the non-conforming party, as if it had been purely an act of aggression against themselves ; for it was treasured up by them, among their other resources of attack. The Archbishop, however, was so completely armed upon the point, that the charge was but feebly insisted upon, and indeed was virtually abandoned³. Nothing could well be more absurd than the accusation, that this was a treasonable invasion of the prerogative of the Crown. The King himself had been the Judge. His own visitatorial power had been guarded by a saving clause. The whole question had been solemnly debated before the council. And, lastly, the privilege claimed by the Archbishop was not unprecedented, but had actually been exercised

¹ Diary, p. 53.

² Heylyn, p. 314, 315.

³ " Mr. Brown" (says Laud) " wholly neglected this charge ; which, making such a show, I think he would not have done, had he found it well-grounded." Troubles, &c. p. 308.

by several of his predecessors. It was alleged, indeed, that even Cardinal Pole had been resisted in his attempt to visit the Universities ; and the allegation was true. But it was also true, that the Cardinal had been opposed, merely because he claimed this power as Legate of the Pope ; whereas it was claimed by Laud solely in right of his See. And yet, in the teeth of this undeniable fact, the claim was reprobated, by the persecutors of Laud, as an act of *Papal* assumption¹!

On the very day after the decision of this question, a project was completed, upon which the Archbishop had bestowed the most laborious care. It had long been known to him, that the Statutes of the University of Oxford had fallen into a state of almost inextricable confusion. Some had gone into desuetude : obedience to others had, from various causes, become impracticable ; and many of them were in direct contradiction to each other. So that the oath which enforced the observance of these laws was, in fact, a snare to the conscience of all who were compelled to take it. With a view to the remedy of these evils, Laud undertook the task of forming this whole mass of regulations into one intelligible digest, accommodated to the existing condition of the University. The Code was then submitted to their consideration ; and, after a final revision by himself, was confirmed by the King, and solemnly accepted by the Convocation, on the 22nd of June, 1636. This service was crowned by the further benefaction of obtaining for them from the Crown the celebrated *Caroline* Charter ; which contained, not only a confirma-

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 307, 308.

tion of all their ancient privileges, but a grant of new ones, as ample and honourable as those which had been long enjoyed by the University of Cambridge¹.

One would scarcely conceive it possible to extort from these useful labours, any materials for arraignment. But nothing is too hard for the perseverance of a vindictive faction. These wise and generous exertions of the Archbishop were afterwards produced in support of a charge so incredibly impudent and absurd, that nothing but the drunken wantonness of power could ever have suggested it, or dared to make it public,—the charge that he had affected the office of *Universal Lawgiver!* To this Laud replied in the language, not merely of conscious innocence, but of conscious merit. He expressed an honest exultation in the accomplishment of the design; and declared that if there was any one action of his life, which called for public gratitude, it was his zealous interference for the prosperity of Oxford. “I wish, with all my heart,” he exclaims, “the times were so open, that I might have the University’s testimony, both of me, and it. Since I cannot,—a great Lord in this House, when this charge was laid against me, supplied, in part, their absence. For, he was overheard to say to another Lord, I think my Lord Archbishop hath done no good work in all his life, but these men will object to it as a crime, before they have done².”

One description of *good works*, however, there was, in which the Archbishop was unwearied, and which no perverse ingenuity could well transmute into *crime*. The distracting responsibilities which

¹ Diary, p. 53. 68. Heylyn, p. 316.

² Troubles, &c. p. 305.

came upon him daily, could never, for a moment, divert him from his course of enlightened munificence. He continued to enrich the University which bred him with a profusion of literary treasure, chiefly manuscripts in various languages, ancient and modern, European and Oriental, which he spared no pains in seeking, or cost in procuring. Equally admirable was his care for the cultivation of those Eastern tongues which were most eminently subservient to the study of Theology. It has already been noticed that, by his intercession, a Canonry of Christ Church was permanently annexed to the royal professorship of Hebrew¹. His good offices were now extended to the Arabic language; a lectureship in which, was established, and afterwards endowed by him, in perpetuity, with a revenue of £40 per annum, and of which the first occupant was the illustrious Pocock. He further obtained the annexation of another Canonry to the office of public orator; a benefit which, however, was subsequently lost to literature, during the period of successful rebellion and usurpation². By these and various other instances of noble and generous patronage, his ascendancy at Oxford became almost supreme³. So powerful was his influence with that University, that the language of gratitude and veneration, in which he was usually addressed by them, exposed him to obloquy, and themselves to the charge of abject, and almost blasphemous, servility. This, however, after all, was

¹ *Heylyn* bears testimony, from personal knowledge, to the beneficial effects of this encouragement to the study of Hebrew. p. 317.

² *Transact. Royal Soc. Lit.* vol. ii. p. 215, 216.

³ *Heylyn*, p. 316, 317.

neither more nor less than a wilful misconstruction of mere formulary phrases. It is true that they often saluted him with the title of "*Your Sanctity.*" But it is perfectly notorious that this, and other similar modes of speech, although they may be offensive to our ears, were very commonly addressed to the Bishops of the Primitive Church; and, if so, they might very innocently be used in Protestant Episcopal Communities¹. They had, however, something of a Popish sound; and they furnished, accordingly, very convenient topics of popular declamation, to those who hated the Archbishop, and despised his adherents and admirers².

The Book of Sports, which had recently been revived, was, at this period, contributing an ample contingent towards the final ruin of the Archbishop. Many of the clergy positively refused obedience to the orders issued by their diocesans for the publication of this obnoxious document. They complained that the Bishops outran the language of the procla-

¹ Grotius begins his Letter of congratulation to Laud, on his elevation to the Primacy, with the following words: "Reverendissime et Illustrissime Domine, vix quenquam esse vestratarum puto, cui tantum obtigerit gaudium, cum primùm *Sanctitatem tuam* provectam ad culmen illud Patriarchicum intelleximus, quam mihi," &c. &c. Grotii Epist. No. 372, p. 136, b. Amst. 1687.—Again, in another letter: "Tantum concepi in bonitate *Sanctitatis tuæ* fiduciam," &c. &c. Grotii Epist. No. 402. May, 1635.—Grotius, it is true, was an Arminian, and an admirer of Laud. But it would be superlatively ridiculous to suppose that Grotius was capable of coining, or of passing current, phrases of profane adulation, even to the Primate of all England.

² The malignity which dictated these calumnies is triumphantly exposed by Laud, in his "*Troubles,*" &c. p. 284—286.

mation; that the business was more fit for constables and tything-men, or, at least, for church-wardens, than it was for ministers of Christ; and, that the clergy were the last persons who ought to be employed as the heralds of licentiousness and profanation¹. That the scruples of these men may, in many instances, have been conscientious and honourable, need not be disputed. That, in some cases, they were grossly factious, is equally unquestionable. But, be this as it may, their contumacy was thought to need the exercise of some severity; and this severity was, of course, spoken of by them and their friends, as so much vindictive persecution. The most conspicuous, or, at least, the noisiest, of the martyrs, was one Richard Culmer. His case stood prominent among those afterwards produced against the Archbishop, in support of the 7th Article of his Impeachment; which charged him, among other things, with a tyrannical abuse of ecclesiastical power². Unless he has been grievously belied, Culmer was eminently worthy of a place among William Prynne's sainted band of witnesses³. It is,

¹ Heylyn, p. 295, 296.

² Troubles, &c. p. 310. 344, &c.

³ In the first place, he was a notorious liar. He complained that he had been deprived of his benefice; whereas, he was only a curate, and had no benefice to lose. He informed against a gentleman, for saying that the Book of Sports was unfit to be read in Churches; and was laid by the heels for the falsehood of his information. Moreover, he was a brutal and ruffian despiser of all consecrated places. He obscenely defiled the Cathedral of Canterbury, and demolished the glass windows with his own hands. And these exploits he repeated in the parish Church of Minster, in Thanet; which benefice he afterwards usurped, during the rebellion. "I have had," says Henry Wharton,

however, undeniable that he was suspended from his office for refusing to read the book of Recreations; and that, when application was made by him for a revocation of the sentence, the Archbishop replied, "if you know not how to obey, I know not how to grant your petition." "And truly," Laud himself observes, "finding him both wilful and ignorant, I cannot tell what I could say less¹." It appears that Culmer remained under suspension, until the assembling of the Long Parliament; and then was released, on a motion to that effect, by Sir E. Dering, in the House of Commons. This, and one or two other cases of the same kind, the circumstances of which were grossly exaggerated, produced a furious outcry among the Non-conformists. The Archbishop was reprobated as a sacerdotal *Plenipotentiary*, and accused of reviving the odious and profane Book of Sports, purely that he might be armed with an instrument, wherewith to gall and vex the godly divines, and drive them from their ministry. If Prynne and Burton were to be believed, the persecution was far heavier than that inflicted on the Church by the bloody Queen Mary herself! The

"more particular opportunities to be informed concerning him, from many yet alive, who know him well; and, upon the whole, think him to be one of the greatest villains in the three kingdoms." Yet this man had the effrontery to plead, that he was conformable in all things else, except in reading the Book of Sports! "For his conformity in other things," Laud observes, "'tis more than ever I heard of. This I can say for him, he is good at purchasing a benefice. For he offered a servant of mine £150, so he could procure me to name him to the Parliament, for Chartham in Kent." See *Troubles, &c.* p. 344, and Henry Wharton's Note.

¹ *Troubles, &c.* p. 344.

resentments of the party were still more bitterly exasperated by the continued vigilance and activity of the Archbishop, for the suppression of lecturers, in various parts of the kingdom. Such, it was said, was the havoc of good and faithful ministers, more especially in the counties of Norfolk and Suffolk, that the flocks were left desolate, as sheep without a shepherd¹!

With the exception of certain festivities at Oxford, at which their Majesties were entertained with dramatic performances, after the fashion of those times, nothing further, of importance, occurred in the year 1636, particularly connected with the history of Laud. On this occasion, he had the honour to receive the King and Queen at his own College, and in the noble gallery erected by himself. The banquet was plenteous and splendid; and the "pleasant Comedy," enacted after dinner in the College Hall, sent the guests away "wrapt up in measureless content." And it may be remarked, that all the scenic representations were under the superintendence of the celebrated Inigo Jones, Surveyor General of his Majesty's Works, and "excellently skilled in setting out a Court Masque to the best advantage²." The entertainment given by the Archbishop took place on the day of St. Felix. And it would seem as if the

¹ See Heylyn, p. 295, 295. 308—314.—Cant. Doom. p. 100. 149—151. By his activity in these prosecutions, the Bishop of Norwich, Dr. Wren, earned for himself the description of a *Wren* soaring on the wings of an *Eagle*. He was resolved, however, to show that neither his pinions, nor his beak, had deserved this comparison. He caused his registers to be searched; and the result exposed the monstrous exaggerations of the malcontents. His report is given by Heylyn, p. 309, 310.

² Heylyn, p. 318, 319.

Saint himself had presided, in a manner worthy of his name: for we find that "all passed *happily*¹;" which is more than can always be said, even for these schemes of transitory and superficial felicity. It would have been well if the same auspicious power had been permitted to spread sunshine over the more arduous ways in which the Archbishop had to travel. But, alas! the gloom continued to thicken round his path: though he, himself, appears to have stood firm and unappalled amid the gathering darkness. That his eyes were not yet opened to all the dangers of his position, was evident from a measure to which he was a party, in the following year, and which appeared to argue an almost judicial ^{1637.} infatuation. It is well known that a collection of enthusiasts had resolved to bid farewell for ever to this land of bigotry and despotism. *Old England*, they said, had been deserted by liberty and the Gospel; and they were determined to follow these heavenly exiles to the shores of *New England*. Eight ships had actually been chartered to convey the suffering remnant to the paradise of civil and religious freedom; when an order from the Council forbade their embarkation. This prohibition was followed by another, declaring that no Clergyman should be allowed to pass to the foreign plantations, without the approbation of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishop of London. And thus, one great *safety-valve* was madly closed up, at a time when the internal pressure was becoming every hour more violent and dangerous²!

¹ Diary, p. 53.

² Heylyn p. 369. In one of his letters to Strafford, Laud

It may, here, be remarked, that New England was, then, the general sanctuary of the Independents: and became, at length, the seat of more merciless intolerance, than was ever known since the towering period of Romish domination¹. It was in contemplation to send out a Bishop to that distempered colony²: and, if the design had been accomplished, it would, probably, have been found the most ungovernable diocese in the Empire! The project, however, was defeated by the more formidable and pressing exigences of the time. The struggle of the impatient elements in this country was, at this period, manifesting itself, in the form of libellous eruptions, more fierce and rabid than the world had often witnessed. The names of Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick, are so familiar to the readers of English history, that a brief notice of these masters in the art of railing, may be sufficient for our present purpose. Foremost, in this immortal triumvirate, stands William Prynne. He was born in 1600; was admitted a Fellow Commoner of Oriel College, Oxford, in 1616; and was afterwards called to the Bar. The Puritanical infection seized upon him, in his boyhood. He became an idolater of Preston, who was himself an idolater of Calvin. The disease, in the course of time, was aggravated almost to lunacy. It would nearly occupy a small volume to enumerate the works in which his ravings found

speaks of "the running to New England, as something *monstrous*." *Straff. Lett. &c.* vol. ii. p. 169.

¹ It was the complaint of Principal Baillie, that "there was no living in that country, for a Presbyterian, though he should be an angel for life and doctrine."

² Heylyn, p. 369.

vent. At last the phials of his fury were poured out upon the antichristian recreations of the theatre; and all abominations of the same pernicious family and kindred. He had, for some time, been heaping up incredible stores of useless learning, both sacred and profane, with a view to the demolition of these "inventions of the devil:" and in 1632, the whole collection was discharged, in the shape of an enormous volume, under the title of *Histrionastix*, or the "Scourge of Players;" which, however, he retracted in 1649! In this book,—says Heylyn, who was employed to analyse it,—“he seemed to breathe nothing but disgrace to the nation, infamy to the Church, reproaches to the Court, dishonour to the Queen, and some things which were thought to be tending to the destruction of his Majesty's person.” The music of Cathedrals, the Christmas festivities of the gentry, the gallantries of the Court, the masquings and dancings of the King and Queen¹,—all were mercilessly assailed by the lash of the avenger. The Calvinists glorified him as a scourge in the hand of God: and the Court thought it highly expedient that he should enjoy the honours of martyrdom. He was, accordingly, turned over to the tender mercies of the Star Chamber. His sentence must have been highly gratifying to the libeller, if his sole object was to bear an heroic testimony to the truth; but, like that pronounced on Leighton, it was unspeakably disgraceful to the *spirit of the age*. He was condemned to a fine of 5000*l.*; to expulsion

¹ “The whip,” says Fuller, “was so used by his hand, that some conceived the lashes thereof flew into the face of the Queen herself.” Fuller, Ch. Hist. b. xi. p. 152.

from the University, and degradation from the Bar ; to the loss of both his ears, in the pillory ; to the ignominy of seeing his book burnt before his face by the common hangman ; and, lastly, to imprisonment for life ¹.

One part of this sentence was executed with extreme severity ; for Prynne was almost suffocated by the combustion of his own volume, under his very nose. Another part of it was performed with such exemplary lenity, that it gave rise to the report of a miracle. His ears were so considerably pared at their circumference, that there were some, who believed that the martyr was honoured by a preternatural reproduction of the amputated organs. The indulgence of invective, however, seems still to have been the first of earthly enjoyments to Prynne: and, if so, he must have continued to lead a very happy life, in spite of his punishment. For, the interval between the execution of his sentence and the present year, was distinguished by a series of publications, each, if possible, more libellous than its predecessor. The last of these was entitled “ News from Ipswich ;” in which, amidst other sallies of rhetoric, the Archbishop was termed the Arch-agent of the Devil ; the Prelates, generally, Luciferian Lord Bishops, execrable traitors, and devouring wolves ; and Bishop Wren, brother of Sir C. Wren, more particularly, a monster of persecution, such as could not be matched even in the days of Queen Mary ². And thus, he became a candidate for a second crown of martyrdom.

Dr. John Bastwick was a physician of considerable

¹ Heylyn, p. 230, 231. 264, 265.

² Ibid. p. 328, 329.

scholarship, moderate wit, and very tumultuous passions. He had been confined in the Gatehouse since 1633, by a sentence of the High Commission, for a Latin treatise, entitled *Flagellum Episcoporum Latialium*, which was considered as a libel, by implication, upon the Anglican Prelates, as well as those of Rome. He solaced his imprisonment by the composition of a fresh libel in English, which was published in 1634, under the title of "the Litany of Dr. John Bastwick." "The piece," says Heylyn, "was so silly and contemptible, that nothing but the sin and malice which appeared in every line thereof could possibly preserve it from appearing ridiculous¹." It reprobated the Bishops as invaders of the prerogative, despisers of Scripture, patrons of idolatry, and servants of the Devil; and consequently marked the author as a very fit companion and fellow-worker to William Prynne.

The third of these worthies was Henry Burton, a turbulent Divine, who having aspired, in vain, to the office of Clerk of the Closet, indemnified himself for his disappointment by turning a seditious Lecturer². He had long been dogging the path of Laud; and now sprung upon him and his brethren with a tremendous yell. In November, 1636, he delivered a sermon, at his Church in Friday-street, upon the text, *My son, fear thou the Lord and the King; and meddle not with them that are given to change.*—Prov. xxiv. 21.; in which he exhausted a mighty magazine of invective against the whole order of Prelates. They were miscreants, and sons of

¹ Heylyn, p. 328.

² Clarendon, vol. i. p. 350, 351. Oxf. Ed.

Belial, — factors of Antichrist, — new builders of Babel, — robbers of souls, false prophets, and limbs of the Beast, — not *pillars* of the Church, but *caterpillars*; their houses haunted, and their chairs poisoned, by the spirit that bears rule in the air. Of all these prodigies of iniquity, Wren was the most odious and the most formidable. He was used to set his foot on the King's laws, as the Pope did on the Emperor's neck; and was able, with his right hand, to sweep down a third part of the stars in heaven¹.

When these men were brought before the Star-chamber, they did all they could to aggravate their misdeeds, by artifices of contumacious delay; by attempting to file a cross-bill against "Canterbury and his confederates;" and by stuffing their answers with matter as libellous as their publications. No counsel could be found to affix his signature to such documents; and the prisoners were consequently treated as self-convicted men. Their sentence is well known. Prynne was condemned to pay a fine of £5000; to lose the remainder of his ears; and to be branded with the letters S. L. (Schismatical Libeller). Bastwick and Burton were likewise sentenced, each to a similar fine, and to the loss of their ears in the pillory: and all three were sent to remote, and separate, places of imprisonment.

These punishments were frightfully excessive; but they were endured with astonishing heroism. Such was the triumphant fortitude of Prynne, that he won for himself the name of *William the Conqueror!* The members of the three professions, Law, Medicine, and Divinity, were, many of them, deeply outraged by

¹ Heylyn, p. 329, 330.

the ignominious fate of their suffering brothers. It is infinitely to be deplored, that there was no warning voice to remind the judges of the folly, as well as the cruelty, of punishing men, till the sympathies of the world are deeply engaged on their behalf. No writings or ravings of these dogged enthusiasts could have done the government half so much mischief as their public exposure and mutilation. But whatever may have been the absurdity or the barbarity of these inflictions, it would be monstrous to heap up their undivided enormity upon the head of Laud. Prynne himself is contented with affirming that the prosecution originated *principally* with the Archbishop: and even this is nothing more than his own bare assertion¹. Every member of the Court concurred in the sentence: and although Laud “spoke his conscience” on the occasion, he abstained from voting, because the virulence of the delinquents was chiefly directed against himself². It further should be kept in mind, that these coarse operations of penal justice were the reliques of a sanguinary and uncivilized age. They were the excesses of the times rather than of individuals. In the days of Elizabeth, Stubbs had his right hand cut off for too bold and rude an address to her Majesty. And, as Laud observes, “Penry was hanged, and Udal condemned, and died in prison, for less than is contained in Mr. Burton’s book³.”

¹ Cant. Doom. p. 146. In the Harleian MSS. 6865. p. 81, &c. is a “Brief Relation” of the prosecution of these men. And it is very remarkable that, although the narrative is evidently drawn up by one who entertained a cordial admiration for the sufferers, it is silent as to the share of Laud in the proceedings.

² Troubles, &c. p. 144, 145.

³ Troubles, &c. p. 145. Penry was the author of *Martin Marprelate*; and Udal was one of his auxiliaries.

No one, in our own age, will ever think of alleging such instances, in vindication of the severity inflicted upon these incendiaries. But they may very justly be produced, to expose the malignity which seized on every occasion to picture Laud as a monster of inhumanity, and as an enemy to the liberties and the religion of his country.

The prosecution of these brave fanatics furnished the Archbishop with an opportunity of delivering an elaborate vindication of himself, and his brethren of the Bench, from the charge (with which the country was ringing from one end to the other) of attempting to bring back the dominion of Popery, and of corrupting the simplicity of the Anglican Church by pernicious *novelties*. This speech produced so deep an impression on all who heard it, that the King commanded him to print it¹, in the hope that it might have the effect of disabusing the public mind. Laud, of course, complied. But it soon appeared that this would be only speaking to the tempest. The waters were rising, day by day, and there was no human voice which could say to the deluge, Thus far shalt thou go, and no further! Libel upon libel was scattered in the streets, and posted upon the walls. On the 7th of July, a paper was fixed to the Cross in Cheapside, declaring that "the Arch-Wolf of Canterbury had his hand in persecuting the *Saints*, and shedding the blood of the *Martyrs*." On the 23rd of August, the Lord Mayor sent to Lambeth another paper, which had been found by the watch at the South gate of St. Paul's, importing that the Devil

¹ This speech is to be found in Laud's Remains; and Heylyn has given a copious abstract of it. Heyl. p. 335—340.

had let that house to his Grace. On the 25th, a notice was fastened to the North gate, to the effect that the Church of England was like a candle in the snuff, going out in a stench. In the following night a drawing was found hanging upon the standard in Cheapside, exhibiting the Archbishop's speech in the Star-chamber, set in something like a pillory. And, four days afterwards, he was lampooned in a copy of ribald verses¹. The outrageous slanders of Prynne and his companions, followed as they were by these furious commentaries, gave abundant confirmation to the remark of Laud, at the opening of his speech, that the *Saints* and *Martyrs* of that day were themselves the most unscrupulous of *innovators*; for they had adopted a mode of defending religion unknown to the primitive Christians, whom no heat of persecution could betray into railing and invective. With regard to himself, he declares at the conclusion of his address that he was in a condition like that of Cyprian, who, when assailed by Schismatics, conceived himself bound not to answer them by revilings, but to write and speak only as became a Priest of God. He added that, by God's grace, the reproaches of such men should not cause him to faint, or start aside from the rule of faith, and the right way of practice. And he finished by thanking the Court for their just and honourable censure of those libellers, manifested in "their *unanimous dislike* of them, and defence of the Church." But he excused himself from any share in pronouncing sentence upon them, on the ground that "the business had some reflection upon

¹ Diary, p. 54, 55.

himself." And so he left them to God's mercy, and the King's justice¹.

The year 1637 was remarkable for the issue of another prosecution against a person of a very different stamp, the history of which would, of itself, occupy an ample volume. Our notice of it must, unavoidably, be brief. In 1627 the King held a private conference with Bishop Williams, in which he desired the counsel of the Bishop, respecting the best course that could be taken for winning the confidence and attachment of the Commons. The advice of Williams was, that the King should *secretly* instruct his Ministers to show some connivance and indulgence to the Puritans, whose numbers and influence were far too formidable to be despised; adding, however, that he could not undertake to promise that they would long be trusty to any government. Charles replied, that he himself had thought of the same expedient, and that he would make trial of it accordingly. Not long after, the Bishop was heard to recommend, at his own table at Buckden, a considerable relaxation of the severities against the non-conforming party; alleging as a reason, that the King had signified to him, with his own lips, that such was his royal pleasure. These words were doubtless very unadvisedly spoken, and tended to commit the Government to an extent that might be found extremely inconvenient and embarrassing; but they could hardly have been uttered with a disloyal or treacherous intent. Nevertheless, they were pregnant with calamity and disgrace to the speaker; for,

¹ Heylyn, p. 340.

about three years afterwards, they were maliciously reported to Laud, and by him communicated to the King¹. The consequence was, that a bill was filed against the Bishop in the Star-chamber, for revealing the secrets of the King; himself being a sworn Privy Counsellor.

It happened that, at that time, Williams was living at Buckden, in a style of somewhat ostentatious magnificence; which, it was apprehended by the Court, might invest him with a dangerous influence among the Puritans, whom he had already shown a strong disposition to protect. These fears were, doubtless, aggravated by the discovery of his indiscretion in speaking so openly of the intentions of the King: and to this cause may reasonably be ascribed the severity with which his prosecution was driven on. It is impossible for us to plunge into the labyrinth of these proceedings. We must be content to state that, on the one hand, Williams has been accused of resorting to all the artifices of legal chicanery, and to practices still more unworthy and dishonourable: and that, on the other hand, Laud has been condemned for the unfeeling and vindictive malice with which he is alleged to have persecuted his ancient rival. Such is the intricacy and obscurity of the whole affair, in all its ramifications, that the most dispassionate enquirer would, probably, feel it difficult to satisfy himself as to the precise amount of blame incurred by either party². It is,

¹ This is Hacket's account, pt. ii. p. 80.—Heylyn merely says that the Bishop was complained of to some great men about the Court. p. 172.

² They who have patience and curiosity for the task, may

however, but just to mention that, when, at last, a new bill was filed against Williams, for tampering with the witnesses in the original cause, a speech was delivered by the Archbishop, in which (after bitterly lamenting that a distinguished Churchman should have placed himself in a condition which would expose his sacred profession to vulgar obloquy) he protested that he had repeatedly and urgently interceded with the King on his behalf, and once had saved him from ruin; but, nevertheless, had been "coarsely dealt with, and ill requited" for his services¹. He even averred that he had been five times on his knees before his Majesty for the Bishop; but, nevertheless, he declared that now he would not interfere to screen a *suborner of perjury* from the heaviest censure that might fall upon him². The censure, in truth, was heavy enough to crush any man who was gifted with a less inflexible spirit, or a less mighty purse. On the 11th of July, in this year³, Williams was condemned to pay a fine of £10,000 to the King; to be suspended from all his benefices and offices; and to be imprisoned in the Tower at the King's pleasure. And nothing can be more disgusting than the ravenous eagerness with which the harpies of confiscation flew upon his property.

But this was not all. The search of the Bishop's premises at Buckden produced the materials of another prosecution. A letter was found among his papers, addressed to him by one Osbaldston, formerly

compare the diffuse narrative of Hacket (pt. ii. p. 111—139) with the statements of Heylyn, p. 172. 343, &c. &c.

¹ Rushw. vol. ii. p. 423—435.

² Heylyn, p. 344.

³ Diary, p. 54.

master of Westminster School, then a prebendary of Westminster, in which it was written, "that the little vermin, the urchin, the *Hocus Spocus*, was at variance with the Great Leviathan." And, as the stature of Laud was diminutive, and he was known to have been on unfriendly terms with the Lord Treasurer Weston, at the time when the letter was written, it was concluded that the above ambiguous and stupid pleasantry must have been penned with reference to that dispute. Another information was the consequence; and the issue of it was, that, in the next year, 1638, Williams and his correspondent were found guilty of *scandalum magnatum*; that Williams was sentenced to an additional fine of £5,000 to the King, and £3,000 to the Archbishop; and that Osbaldston was fined £5,000 to the King, £5,000, to the Archbishop, degraded from his preferments, and condemned to have his ears nailed to the pillory! Osbaldston thought it prudent to save his ears by flight, and he left a paper in his study, signifying that he was *gone beyond Canterbury*¹. Williams, of course, remained in the Tower; from which he was released, in November, 1640, by an order of the House of Lords, and restored to his place among them, on the Bishops' Bench. Shortly afterwards, he was received into favour by the King, who ordered the record of all proceedings against him to be taken off the file and cancelled².

¹ Heylyn, p. 345, 346. Hacket, ubi supra.

² Hacket, p. 138. On this occasion, Hacket observes, "A prisoner, whose liberty I much wished for, is released; but out of limbo, into Hell:" that is, out of the Tower, into—the House of Lords!

CHAPTER VII.

A.D. 1637—1640.

Failure of the attempt to introduce the English Liturgy into Scotland—Laud continues to prosecute his ecclesiastical labours—He denounces the intrigues of the Papists before the Council—He reprints his Conference with Fisher ; but is, nevertheless, assailed as an inveterate Papist—Chillingworth reclaimed from Popery by Laud—Laud's intercourse with Hales, for whom he procures a Canonry at Windsor—Laud enforces the censorship of the press—Is assailed for abusing this power—His answer to the charge—His continued munificence—He engages Hall to compose his Treatise on Episcopacy—The corrections suggested by him—He procures the suppression of Bagshaw's readings on Stat. 23. Edw. III. c. 7.—He is assailed as an incendiary—He addresses a letter to the Helvetic Churches, protesting his desire for peace—joins Strafford and Hamilton in recommending a Parliament—Precipitate dissolution of Parliament—The Convocation continues to sit, by order of the King, and with the sanction of the Crown Lawyers—The Canons, and et cetera oath—The public fury directed against Laud—The dreams and presentiments of the Archbishop, on his approaching fall—The prognostics and falsehoods circulated by his enemies—Rome's masterpiece.

THE inauspicious attempt to introduce the English Liturgy, and, with it, a body of Canons, into Scotland, furnishes one copious chapter in the volume of Laud's imputed delinquencies. This subject, in all its details, would scarcely demand less than an elaborate review of the History of the Protestant Scottish Church¹. Our office, however, is solely to deal

¹ Fortunately, such a review would be wholly superfluous to the readers of the *Theological Library*; Dr. Russell having al-

with that portion of it, which, more immediately, involves the motives and the proceedings of Archbishop Laud.

It is known to all, that Scottish episcopacy was shattered by the iron hand of the Reformation; and that King James busied himself, almost his whole life long, in collecting the fragments, and putting them together again. But the task was well nigh hopeless. He did, indeed, contrive to cement the ruins, in such a manner as to give the fabric something of the semblance of what it once had been. After all, however, it was but a frail and sorry structure. It had but little appearance of grandeur or solidity. The work was evidently ready to go to pieces at the first shock. And this shock was given it, by the attempt of Charles to force the detested *service book* upon his northern subjects. The ultimate result of that attempt, was, that episcopacy was laid in the dust; that the solemn league and covenant was substituted for the oath of allegiance, and became the guide, or the tyrant, of every conscience, throughout Scotland; and that the people ran to subscribe it, some to escape proscription, and others, as if they were writing their names in the Book of Life. It had been asserted by Prynne, in England, that Christ was a *Puritan*; and the Anti-Prelatists, in Scotland, discovered that Christ was a *Covenanter*. The Covenant, in short, was Christ's marriage contract. They who refused to subscribe it, were no better than atheists. And, as for the Prelates, the wrath of God would never leave the kingdom, till they were all hanged up before the

ready put them in possession of it, in the second volume of his *History of the Church in Scotland*.

Lord! The issue of all this fanaticism was, that the power of the Crown was made to bow before that dominion, in which Kings and Nobles were "God's silly vassals;" and the Presbyterian Kirk was raised up in such glory, that she was vaunted to be "fair as the moon, and terrible as an army with banners."

It is evident that this dismal train of consequences had never once been anticipated by the King or his advisers. It has already been intimated, that Charles brought away with him from Scotland, in 1633, a firm persuasion that he had but to watch for a seasonable moment, and that a Liturgy might then be introduced into that country, without serious difficulty or opposition. Since that time, the Irish Church had been brought into strict conformity with that of England: and the success of this attempt confirmed the King, and his advisers, in the belief, that a similar design might be accomplished in Scotland. With them, therefore, the only question was, whether the English Liturgy should be proposed, or only a modification of it. The latter was contended for, with urgent importunity, by the Scottish Bishops. They represented, that the jealousies of their nation would be in instant insurrection against a service book imposed by England; and that this danger might be avoided by such alterations, as might give to the New Liturgy the semblance, at least, of a distinct compilation. Upon this, certain of the Scottish Prelates were entrusted with the task of making a collection of Canons, out of the existing constitutions of their own Church; and of effecting the requisite changes in the English ritual. And, both Canons and Liturgy, when completed, were to be submitted to the revisal of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and of Juxon

and Wren, the Bishops of London and Norwich, previously to their publication. With unaccountable precipitancy, the Canons were published first: and this mode of proceeding, besides alarming the people with certain high doctrines relative to the King's prerogative and supremacy, and with the enactment of some ordinances, which were thought to savour too strongly of Popery, disgusted the people by the absurdity of enjoining a strict observance of the Liturgy, which was not yet completed, and which did not make its appearance till a considerable time afterwards. Another fatal inadvertency was, that these Canons themselves were published without the consent or advice of any convocation of the Scottish clergy, and without any communication with the Lords of the Council.

The complexion of the Archbishop's thoughts, and the tenor of his actions, relative to this critical and interesting subject, may best be learned from his own History of his Troubles. That he was, himself, in correspondence with the Scottish Bishops, respecting certain projected alterations, he distinctly avows. That the intended Canons were submitted to him, for his consideration, he also confesses. Neither does he attempt to disguise that he assisted, by way of revision, in the preparation of the Service Book. But he positively affirms, that he never obtruded himself into these offices. On the contrary, he avers that he acted, throughout, under the express injunction of the King; and that, with respect to the Liturgy, he acted most reluctantly. He declares that, from the beginning it was his own wish to introduce the ritual of England, without the slightest alteration. Finding, however, that this would hardly be endured, he was

anxious to decline all further concern in the business: but, being commanded to take a share in the work, he gave his best attention to make it as perfect as might be. It is likewise true, that he openly glories in the design, although it was not precisely such as he could have desired, and deeply regrets its ill success. "I will never deny," he exclaims, "the joy, while I live, which I conceived of the Church of Scotland's coming nearer, both in the Canons and the Liturgy, to the Church of England. But the gross unthankfulness, both to our God, and our King, and our other many and great sins, have hindered this great blessing. And I pray God that the loss of this, which was almost effected, do not, in a short time, prove one of the greatest scourges, that ever befel *this* kingdom, and *that* too¹." Again, "the worst thought I had of any Reformed Church in Christendom, was, to wish it like the Church of England, and so much better as it should please God to make it. And I hope that this was neither to negotiate with Rome, nor to reduce them to heresy in doctrine, nor to superstition and idolatry in worship; no, nor to tyranny in government: all which are, most wrongfully, imputed to me. And, the comparing of me to the Pope himself, I could bear with more ease, had I not written more against Popish superstition *than any Presbyter of Scotland hath done*. And, for my part, I could be content to lay down my life to-morrow, upon condition that the Pope and Church of Rome would admit and confirm the Service Book, which hath been here so eagerly charged against me. For, were that done, it would give a greater blow to

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 100.

Popery, (which is the corruption of the Church of Rome,) than any that hath yet been given : and that they know full well. The Reformed Churches had need look well to themselves. For, if they come out of Babel, to run down to Egypt, they'll get but little by the bargain ¹."

Now, whether, or not, all this is the language of a mistaken man, may fairly and freely be left open to discussion. But, it can hardly be questioned that it is the language of a courageous, honest, and single-hearted man : the language of a man who imagined that he was employed in devising blessings for the Scottish people, not in forging chains for their bodies and their souls : of a man who believed himself engaged in a work which entitled him to gratitude, and not to hatred and persecution unto death.

It would be endless to speculate on the various causes which conspired, with the aversion of the Scots, to defeat the King's design for the assimilation of the two Churches. It was, however, the deliberate opinion both of Strafford and of Laud, that the project, though excellent in its original conception, was wretchedly marred in the manner of conducting it ²." The tumultuous rejection of the service book, and the combination of dark fanaticism and base intrigue, by which the rejection was accomplished, are related in all the histories of that tempestuous period. The failure of the attempt was followed by a course of deplorable misconduct, which ended in the wretched pacification of June, 1639. The interval which elapsed between those two critical events had been a period of comparative tranquillity, in England.

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 134, 135.

² See Strafford's Letters, &c. p. 248. 262.

The Archbishop's Metropolitan Visitation had been gradually producing its desired effect. The controversy respecting the position of the Communion-table was beginning to subside. The Calvinists seemed almost weary of opposition to the royal edicts against the conflicts of the Pulpit. And the Book of Sports itself was, gradually, losing its power to afflict the public conscience. There was, doubtless, an active sympathy between the Puritans and the Covenanters. But the general heart of England was, to all appearance, whole and sound ; or but very slightly touched by treasonable infection. Under these circumstances, the Archbishop had felt himself sufficiently at leisure for the continued prosecution of his ecclesiastical duties. Having made his office felt throughout England, he turned his attention to the Channel Islands. The Islanders had, hitherto, been in the habit of sending their young men, who were designed for the ministry, to receive their theological education at Saumur or Geneva ; "from whence" (says Heylyn) "they returned well seasoned with the leaven of Calvinism." The best remedy for this inconvenience would, obviously, be to allure the students of divinity to Oxford or to Cambridge. And this object the Archbishop hoped partially to accomplish by the foundation of three fellowships, at Exeter, Jesus, and Pembroke Colleges respectively, for so many natives of those Islands. The funds for the endowment of these fellowships were, fortunately, supplied out of the property of Sir Miles Hubard, citizen and alderman of London, who had recently died without an heir, and whose estate had, consequently, escheated to the Crown. On the application of the Archbishop, his Majesty willingly consented that a portion of this

property should be devoted to the purposes in question ¹.

The attention of Laud was painfully occupied, in the course of the year 1637, by the sleepless spirit of Papal intrigue. The Popish emissary, Panzani, having succeeded in establishing a secret intercourse between the Queen of England and the Vatican, left the further prosecution of the work to a Scottish Papist, by the name of Con, who was resident in England as Nuncio of the Pope. The effects of this arrangement soon became visible. The Countess of Newport, a kinswoman of the late Duke of Buckingham, professed her conversion to the Romish faith. The Archbishop had been openly assailed as a secret confederate of the Papal envoy. He now stood forth to repel that most flagitious calumny. He appeared at the Council-Board, to denounce the serpentine policy of Rome. He arraigned, more particularly, the insolence of Walter Montague, and of Sir Toby Mathew, the unworthy son of the late Archbishop of York; both of whom had dared to practise on the consciences of the King's subjects, within the very verge of the Court, and had been mainly instrumental to the defection of Lady Newport. His remonstrances were effectual: and each of the conspirators was promptly banished from the royal presence. The mortification and resentment of the Queen were, at first, tempestuous. But her Majesty soon found herself under the necessity of digesting her displeasure; and at length resumed at least the appearance of cordiality towards the inflexible Archbishop ².

¹ Heylyn, p. 357, 358.

² Ibid. p. 358, 359. Diary, p. 55.

1638. In the course of the following year, 1638, he offered to the world a further pledge of his fidelity to the Protestant Church of England, by enlarging and re-printing his celebrated *Conference with Fisher*, the Jesuit. Not only the personal friends of the Archbishop, but the King himself, were beyond measure anxious for the appearance of this edition ; as furnishing the best of all possible answers to the malignant slanders then in general circulation. The work was completed, and presented to the King, on the 10th of February ; and the next day was exposed to sale. The weapon was, nevertheless, repelled by the triple brass which cased the hearts of his inveterate adversaries. The Puritans were fully resolved that Laud should be a Romanist, and nothing but a Romanist, in spite of himself. This determination was, soon after, manifested in a manner disgraceful, not only to Christian men, but to reasonable beings. It happened that one of the royal Chaplains had preached two sermons, in January, 1638, on the parable of the wheat and the tares. In a casual conversation, relative to these two sermons, soon after the appearance of the Archbishop's new edition of the *Conference*, it was affirmed by some persons of moderate opinions, that the preacher had pulled up Popery by the very roots. Upon which, one of the company declared, that the Archbishop might print, and the doctor might preach, what they pleased against Popery ; but that he should never believe either of them to be less a Papist, for all that ! It is further remarkable that, although neither Priest nor Jesuit could be found to answer this new challenge, the gauntlet was taken up by one who called himself " a witness of Jesus Christ," and who was generally believed to be a Presbyterian

Scot. This anonymous antagonist published, without licence, a "reply to the Relation of a Conference," &c. ; which showed that he was at least as impatient for the ruin of the Archbishop, as for the demolition of Popery itself. The whole work was a tissue of cavil and distortion, from the beginning to the end. And, to show that the impudence of the writer was equal to his perverseness, the work was graced with a dedication to the King ; in which, among other demands, his Majesty was called upon to overthrow the *Altars*, to call in the Book of Sports, to revoke his orders for the restraint of preaching, to restore all suspended ministers, and lastly, to set at liberty the three exiled champions of the truth, "the loud cry of whose oppressions might, otherwise, provoke the thunderbolt of Divine vengeance ¹."

The same year was further memorable for the publication of Chillingworth's immortal work, "The Religion of Protestants a safe way to Salvation." And the mention of it may fitly be introduced, in this place ; since, but for the kind offices of Laud, who was his godfather, the author's mind might never have been brought into the condition necessary for the composition of such a volume. The history of this extraordinary man is perfectly well known. His argumentative powers were so acute and active, that they drove him out to wander,

¹ Heylyn, p. 360, 361. This work was printed in 1640 ; but where, does not appear from the title page : probably in Holland. It is preceded by "A sad and serious Consultation of a disconsolate mother (the Church), with her twelve daughters, Faith, Hope, Charity, Zeal, &c. &c." who, after the completion of the conference, resolved to attend their mother, with a long petition to the King !

for a considerable portion of his life, among the pathless regions of scepticism. For some time, he was a dupe to the artifices of the Jesuit Fisher; and was seduced by him to seek for the truth in the College at Douay. Laud, then Bishop of London, was too faithful to the office of a sponsor, to leave him in the toils of the Romish Church, without a vigorous effort for his deliverance. He commenced a correspondence with him, which ended in Chillingworth's return to England, and his retirement to Oxford, for the free and undistracted prosecution of his inquiries. And, four years afterwards, the cares of his friend and patron were rewarded by the appearance of a book, which has, ever since, been extolled as one of the most perfect models of controversial writing¹.

It was, very probably, in the course of this year, that Laud first became personally acquainted with another illustrious man, the ever memorable John Hales, of Eton; whose name can never be mentioned without reflecting honour on the kindness and liberality of the Archbishop. Hales may be numbered among the most eminent and consummate scholars of that age; but his studies had conducted him to some conclusions, at variance with the principles of Laud,

¹ The honour of recovering Chillingworth is expressly claimed by Laud, in his answer before the Lords, on the first day of his trial. "Mr. Chillingworth's learning and abilities," he says, "are sufficiently known to all your Lordships. He was gone, and settled at Douay. My letters brought him back: and he lived and died a defender of the Church of England. And, that this is so, your Lordships cannot but know. For Mr. Prynne took away my letters, and all that concerned him; and they were examined at the committee." *Troubles, &c.* p. 227.—Prynne, however, would have it, that, after all, Chillingworth died a desperate apostate Papist.—*Ibid.* Henry Wharton's note.

relative to the power and authority of the Church. At the request of some friend, he embodied his thoughts on this subject in the form of a little tract concerning Schism and Schismatics; which, though not published, had been circulated in manuscript more widely than he had intended. At last, it came into the hands of the Archbishop; who discovered in it, with much regret, some positions which he regarded as false and dangerous. On learning that his grace was dissatisfied, Hales addressed to him a letter of explanation and apology¹; which appears to have produced an interview at Lambeth, of which the following curious account is given by Dr. Heylyn, who was at Lambeth palace when this interview took place. Hales, having been invited to a conference with the Archbishop, attended at the time appointed, to know his grace's pleasure. The Archbishop "took him into his garden, commanding that none of his servants should come to him, on any occasion. There they continued in discourse, till the bell rung to prayers; and, after prayers were ended, till the dinner was ready; and, after that, too, till the coming in of Lord Conway, and some other persons of honour, put a necessity upon some of his servants to give him notice how the time had passed away. So in they came, high-coloured, and almost panting for want of breath; enough to show that there had been some heats between them, not then fully cooled. It was my chance," says Heylyn, "to be there that day, either to know his grace's pleasure, or to render an account of some former commands; but I know not which. And I found

¹ Des Maizeaux's Life of Hales.

Hales very glad to see me in that place, as being himself a mere stranger to it, and unknown to all. He told me, afterwards, that he found the Archbishop (whom he knew before for a nimble disputant) to be as well versed in books as business; that he had been ferretted by him from one hole to another, till there was none left to afford him further shelter; that he was now resolved to be orthodox, and to declare himself a true son of the Church of England, both for doctrine and for discipline; that, to this end, he had obtained leave to call himself his Grace's Chaplain, that, naming him as his Lord and Patron, the greater notice might be taken of the alteration¹."

It may be proper to observe, that some discredit has been thrown upon the account of this conference, as left us by Dr. Heylyn². That an interview, however, was actually held between Laud and Hales, is placed, by the narrative of Heylyn, beyond all reasonable doubt; though it is by no means impossible that the result of that interview may have been partially misunderstood, or exaggerated, by the narrator. Thus much, at least, is certain, that the

¹ Heylyn, p. 361, 362. — Life of Clarendon, vol. i. p. 58—62.

² See Des Maizeaux's Life of Hales; where we are told that Hales was then in his 54th year; and was not likely to be *ferretted* out of his opinions, in a few hours, at that time of life, by Laud, or by any man. It does not appear that Heylyn was aware of Hales's apologetic letter to Laud. It is, further, clear that Heylyn was mistaken in ascribing to Hales a Socinian treatise, entitled *Disquisitio Brevis*, &c. It was the work of Joachimus Stegmannus, a Socinian minister. So, at least, Des Maizeaux asserts, on the authority of Sandius's *Biblioth. Anti-Trinitariorum*, published in Holland, 1684.

Archbishop was sufficiently satisfied, either with the written explanation, or the personal conference, or both, to procure for Hales a Canonry of Windsor¹. And it should be added, that nothing but strong importunity could overcome the reluctance of Hales to accept this preferment. He held, at that time, a Fellowship of Eton College, together with the office of Bursar; and these, together, furnished him with an income more than adequate to his necessities: and, for this reason, he was unwilling to receive what he considered as a mere superfluity. It has been insinuated that he was enlightened rather by his Grace's patronage, than by his arguments or his abilities. It would be the most shameful of all injuries to his memory to deem a syllable necessary, in answer to so disgraceful an imputation. The very name of Hales, "the ever memorable," is sufficient for its demolition. That he was accounted by the republican faction to be, what he professed, a sound and orthodox Churchman, in doctrine and in discipline, is evident from the fact, that he lost all his preferment on the first eruption of the civil war; and died in 1656, if not in actual beggary, at least in comparative indigence. He retained the most cordial veneration for his patron; and, when he heard of his execution, burst into tears, and ardently

¹ That the Canonry was procured by Laud, is beyond all question: as appears by the following extract from the correspondence of Sir Henry Wotton: "My Lord's Grace of Canterbury hath, this week, very nobly sent hither to Mr. Hales a Prebendaryship of Windsor, unexpected, undesired." *Reliquiæ Wotton.* p. 369. The Patent is dated 23d May, 1639. *Des Maizeaux*, p. 19.

wished that he could preserve the Archbishop's life by the sacrifice of his own¹.

About this period, the Archbishop (still not having the fear of the Puritans before his eyes) felt it his duty to enforce the law for the suppression of dangerous and fanatical publications. On the first of July, 1637, a decree had been passed by the Star-chamber, at his recommendation, for controlling the unbridled licence of the press. The provisions of this edict were sufficiently severe. It limited the number of master printers, under the penalty of whipping; it forbade the printing, or re-printing, of books, without a licence from the Archbishop, or the Bishop of London, or their Chaplains, or from the Chancellors or Vice-Chancellors of the Universities; it prohibited the sale of imported books, without a similar licence; it authorized the Company of Stationers to seize on all such books as they found to be schismatical and offensive, and to lay them before the ecclesiastical authorities; it enacted that no one in England should cause to be printed any books in English, beyond the seas, or to import them into this country; and, finally, it provided that offences against this decree should be punished by the court of Star-chamber, or High Commission².

It would be an almost interminable labour to inquire whether the power over the press which was placed, by this decree, in the hands of the Archbishop, or his Licensers, was used in every instance, with consummate wisdom and moderation. If we are to trust his enemies and detractors, it was shame-

¹ Biogr. Dict.—Hales.

² Heylyn, p. 363.

fully abused, and converted into an instrument for the protection of Popery, and the suppression of all scriptural truth. The calumny was indignantly repelled by the Archbishop, at his trial. He affirms, that the power in question was employed solely for the preservation of the peace of the Church, and the safety of the State. He does not, indeed, deny that there may possibly have been cases, in which his licensing Chaplains exercised their office with more of zeal, than of knowledge or discretion. But he protests against the injustice of loading him with all the imaginable faults which may have been committed by his officers, in the discharge of duties much too various and extensive for his perpetual inspection. And he, further, contends that the decree itself was absolutely indispensable for the safety of the Church; which, he says, (certainly with more truth than wit,) was almost *pressed* to death by the liberty of printing ¹."

Of all the publications of that day, none were more savory to the palate of rebellion and fanaticism, than the Genevan edition of the Bible; garnished as it was with notes, the spirit of which might, in some respects, have done honour to Rheims or Douay!

¹ More than one hundred of Prynne's closely printed folio pages are filled with alleged instances of the abuse of the power of licensing by the Archbishop and his Chaplains. Cant. Doom. p. 245—348. It does not appear, however, that this matter was very largely insisted on, at the Archbishop's trial. In the 9th Article of his impeachment, he was accused of committing the licensing of books to Chaplains notoriously disaffected to the Reformed religion, and grossly addicted to Popish superstition. But the charges under this head, together with his own answers, occupy little more than five pages in the History of his Troubles, &c. p. 348—354.

They proclaimed that Kings might be disobeyed, and even murdered, if they were *idolaters*; that no bond or promise was binding, which had any tendency injurious to the Gospel; that the right of the Presbytery was transcendently divine; and that Archbishops, and Bishops, and men in Episcopal orders or Academical degrees¹, were to be regarded as no better than the locusts of the Apocalypse, that came up out of the pit. The pontifical arrogance of Hildebrand himself might be defied to go beyond this. King James was so disgusted with these atrocious commentaries, that he forbade them to be printed in his dominions, and ordered the English version to be published without notes. But, to the Non-conformists, the Geneva Bible was almost a necessary of their spiritual life². And, accordingly, it continued to be printed in Holland, (the strong-hold of Calvinism, and the common receptacle of English malcontents,) and to be thence abundantly imported into England. It, moreover, came recommended, not only by its seditious doctrines, but by the moderation of its price, and the superiority of its paper, typography, and binding. The Archbishop received intelligence from Sir William Boswell, the Resident at the Hague, that two impressions of this Bible, in English, were ready

¹ If we may venture to judge by certain recent proceedings, a considerable revolution has taken place, since that time, in the notions entertained by Dissenters, relative to the value and honour of *Academical Degrees*.

² Heylyn, p. 350, 351. Here, again, it may be observed, the Dissenters of the present day are widely at variance with their predecessors. For they now vehemently insist on the circulation of the Scriptures, *without note or comment*.

for transmission into this kingdom, the one with notes, the other without; and he was prepared to meet this importation of mischief, with the terrors of the above decree. He was, further, warned by John Le Maire, one of the most distinguished preachers at Amsterdam, that Holland was the place in which the turbulent spirits of the time were perpetually forging their weapons against the Church of England. Upon which, he employed the agency of Sir William Boswell so effectually, that the States were pleased to put forth a proclamation, prohibiting all such libellous and inflammatory performances. The Puritanical party, as may easily be conceived, was, beyond measure, exasperated at these proceedings. Nevertheless, when these misdeeds were laid to the charge of the Archbishop, he neither denied the fact of his interference, nor affected remorse for it. He intrepidly declared that he neither was, nor could be, sorry for what he had done ¹. One can hardly expect much cordial or general sympathy with his feelings, in these more enlightened days of toleration. But, it may, at least, be conceded, that, if the authority of a censor could ever be justified, it would be when the strictest professors of Religion were the heralds of disobedience, perfidy, and assassination. And it should, further, be remembered, that, in the days of their supremacy, the Presbyterians resisted even the eloquence of Milton, when it pleaded for the freedom of unlicensed printing.

In the midst of all this care and toil, while his energies were tasked to the uttermost for the honour and stability of the Church,

1639.

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 350, 351.

and his name was torn to pieces by ingratitude and calumny, the Archbishop was unwearied in devising liberal and glorious things for the cause of literature and charity. He erected, at his own cost, a stately pile at the west end of the Divinity School, at Oxford; the lower part for the assembling of Convocations, the upper as a repository for learned writings. "And," as Heylyn quaintly remarks, "that he might not be said to have given them nothing but an empty box," he furnished it with no less than 576 manuscripts, in addition to 700 which he had sent before; of which, one hundred were Hebrew, Arabic, and Persian¹. His munificence was, likewise, extended to his native town of Reading; upon which he bestowed a revenue of £200 per annum, to be employed in apprenticing young men, in assisting meritorious beginners in trade, in furnishing marriage-portions to deserving female servants, and, lastly, in augmenting the stipend of the minister of the Parish Church of St. Laurence. He also purchased the perpetual advowson of the same Church, and annexed it to the patronage of St. John's College. Certain other noble designs, of a more public nature, were entertained by him; some of which were executed, and others interrupted by the calamitous vicissitudes which fell upon him. Among those which he was not spared to accomplish, may be mentioned, his projects for increasing the poorer vicarages, for the settlement of the London tithes, for the establishment of a Greek press at Oxford, and for obtaining a grant from his Majesty, for the purchase of impropriations. He, further, intended to

¹ Heylyn, p. 404. Diary, p. 56.

procure, at his own charge, a copy, on vellum, of all the Records in the Tower, relating to the Clergy, from the 20th of Edward I. to the end of Henry VIII.: but the troubles of the time prevented the completion of this work to a later period than the 14th of Edward IV.¹ In order that the learned men of Europe might be enabled to judge between that Church and the faction which assailed it, he caused the Liturgy which had been rejected by the Scots to be translated into Latin: but the publication of it was prevented by the same unhappy cause which stifled several of his other undertakings. Fortunately, the English Liturgy itself was already before the world, in various tongues. The Service Book of Edward VI. had been translated into Latin by Alexander Aless, for the use of Martin Bucer; and that of Queen Elizabeth by Walter Haddon, President of Magdalene College, Oxford. A French version of it had been prepared for the use of the Channel Islands; and, by order of King James, it had been rendered into Spanish, under the patronage of the Lord Keeper Williams. A Greek version was still wanting; and this deficiency was now supplied by the care of Archbishop Laud, who encouraged Petley, of Oxford, to the performance of the task. So that, at last, the Eastern and Western Churches were placed in a condition to compare our formularies of devotion with those of the primitive ages².

A much more arduous work was, about the same period, committed by Laud to the hands of the

¹ See the list of projects at the end of the Diary, p. 68, 69. The copy of the Records was finished, thus far, in June, 1637: and is now deposited in the Library of Lambeth Palace.

² Heylyn, p. 397, 398.

venerable Joseph Hall, then Bishop of Exeter. The Covenanters had denounced Episcopacy, as not only unlawful, but as positively anti-christian. Laud, like the soundest and most faithful of his brethren, was profoundly convinced that the institution was divine: and he was extremely anxious that the task of proving it to be so, should be undertaken by Hall. The Bishop consented to grapple with the enterprize. His first step was to frame a draught or skeleton of his intended treatise; which he despatched to Laud, in October, 1639. It occurred to the Archbishop, on the perusal of this draft, that Hall had taken his position on ground somewhat lower and less advantageous than he was entitled to occupy. The nature of his objections may be best learned from one or two extracts of a letter addressed by him to the Bishop, on the 11th of November following. The following extracts will furnish the reader with a distinct notion of the Archbishop's views on the subject of Episcopal authority. They were stigmatized as insufferably Popish, in his own time; and, in some quarters, they may, possibly, meet with no better a reception, at this present day. "You say," Laud observes, "that Episcopacy is an ancient, holy, and divine institution. It must needs be ancient and holy, if divine. Would it not be more full, went it thus: *so ancient, that it is of* divine institution? Next, you define Episcopacy as being joined with imparity, and superiority of jurisdiction. But this seems short. For, every Archbishop's, Archpresbyter's, and Archdeacon's place, is so. And so was Mr. Henderson in his chair at Glasgow; unless you define it by a distinction of *order*. I draw the superiority, not from the jurisdiction,

which is attributed to Bishops, *jure positivo*, in their audience of ecclesiastical matters; but from that which is intrinsical and original, in the power of excommunication. Again, you say, in the first point, that *where* Episcopacy hath obtained, it cannot be abdicated without a violation of God's ordinance. This proposition, I conceive, is *inter minus habentes*. For never was there any Church yet, where it hath not obtained. The Christian faith never yet was planted any where, but the very first feature of a Church was by, or with, Episcopacy. And, where-soever now Episcopacy is not suffered, it is by such an abdication: for, certainly, there it was *à principio*. In your second head, you grant, that the Presbyterian government may be of use, where Episcopacy may not be had. First, I pray you consider, whether this conversion be not needless here; and, of itself, of a dangerous consequence. Next, I conceive there is no place where Episcopacy may not be had, if there be a Church more than in title only. Thirdly, since they challenge their Presbyterian fiction to be Christ's kingdom and ordinance, (as yourself expresseth,) and cast out Episcopacy as opposite to it, we must not use any mincing terms, but unmask them plainly. Nor shall I ever give way, to hamper ourselves, for fear of speaking plain truth; though it be against Amsterdam or Geneva. And this must be sadly thought on."

"Concerning your *postulata*, I shall pray you to allow me the like freedom: among which, the two first are true, but, as expressed, too restrictive. For, episcopacy is not so to be asserted unto Apostolic institutions, as to bar it from looking higher, and from fetching it, materially, and originally, from Christ

himself: though, perhaps, the Apostles *formalized* it." He then goes on to show the necessity of so vindicating episcopacy, against the "furious puritans," as not to lay it open to more crafty and more learned adversaries. The Romanists, he says, will be content that it should be invested with Divine right, on condition that the right be derived to the Bishops, not immediately, but through the Pope; that, so the government of the Church may be *monarchical*, in him. The milder Geneva school will, likewise, allow the right to be divine, provided that this be taken to imply no more than the divine approbation of it, without claiming for it the sanction of a command, divine and universal¹. If this were good divinity, it is manifest that the cause of episcopacy would have been destitute of all defence against the pretensions of the Scots; who contended that, although they had episcopacy once, they were at liberty to abandon it, upon wiser thoughts; and so, to reduce the government of the Church to a democracy. With regard to Hall's ninth *postulatum*, (which maintained that the accession of honourable titles and privileges made no difference in the substance of the calling,) the Archbishop recommended the most cautious handling: lest the faction should seize upon it, as a virtual admission, that, in calling

¹ This was the view entertained by Grotius; who says, in a letter to Bishop Overall, "Episcopatus vocem sumsi eo significatu, ut προστρασίαν (*præfecturam*) indicet, non temporariam, sed perpetuam. Hanc defendo juris esse divini, *probantis et suadentis, non tamen universaliter imperantis*. Ceterum, προστρασίαν, sumtam abstractè, citrà considerationem durationis, esse juris divini, etiam imperantis, ostendi ab ipso Bezâ agnosci." Præst. Vir. Epist. p. 487. b.

and order, the Bishop and the Priest were one ; and that the title of Bishop amounted to nothing more than a mere honorary distinction.

It appears from the reply of Bishop Hall to these animadversions, that he admitted their justice, as it were, by anticipation : for he declares that he had already amended several of the passages touched upon by Laud, previously to the arrival of his criticism ¹. The work was completed accordingly ; and then was transmitted to the Archbishop, for his final revision. It appears that, in several particulars, something was yet wanting for his grace's perfect satisfaction. He observed, that the foreign Churches, and their authors, were still treated with a degree of indulgence that might be dangerous to the cause of the Church of England ; that it had been treated as a matter of indifference whether episcopacy were an *order*, or merely a *degree* ; and, lastly, that the title of Anti-Christ had been, in several places, bestowed upon the Pope, *positively and determinately* ; whereas it was well known, that although King James had written apparently to the same effect, yet he had done so, " not concluding, but by way of argument only ; that the Pope and his adherents might see, that there were as good, and better, arguments, to prove him Anti-Christ, than for the Pope to challenge temporal jurisdiction over Kings." He adds that he had found himself under the necessity of representing this matter to King Charles ; and urges that it would be proper to qualify expressions, so directly in opposition to the judgment of his Majesty's Royal Father ; the rather, because Protestants were

¹ Heylyn, p. 398—402. Cant. Doom. p. 227—238.

far from unanimous in this opinion of Anti-Christ¹." To these remarks, Hall returned a very courteous and respectful answer: and (according to the statement of Heylyn) "he qualified some of his expressions, and expunged others; to the contentment of his Sovereign, the satisfaction of his metropolitan, and his own great honour²." And, to this hour, the work maintains an honourable place in the Theological Armoury of the Church of England. The controversy which it produced with a five-headed adversary, under the name of *Smectymnuus*, is well known to all the readers of English Ecclesiastical History.

It is unhappily notorious, that the temporal privileges of the Bishops were, at that period, as furiously assailed as their ecclesiastical dignity. In the course of this year, the spirit of revolution found utterance by the mouth of a Lawyer. One Bagshaw, a Barrister, of the Middle Temple, being chosen Reader of that Society, for the Lent vacation, selected for his argument the Statute 25 Edw. III. c. 7. He distributed his discourse into ten parts; and each part into ten sections: by which arrangement, says Heylyn, "he must have had one hundred blows at the Church, in his ten days' reading." His main design was, to vindicate the Prohibitions issued from Westminster Hall to stop the proceeding of the Spiritual Courts, and, more especially, of the High Commission. He

¹ This letter of Laud is dated Jan. 14, 1639. It has already been noticed that Prynne has, with admirable logic, concluded from all this, that Laud must have been a prime adviser, in that whole *mystery of iniquity*, the Spanish match, &c. &c. Cant. Doom. p. 263, 264. 276.

² Canterbury's Doom. p. 227—238. Heylyn, p. 398—406.

commenced his lecture with the discussion of three questions: *first*, whether an act of Parliament were valid, without the assent of the spiritual Lords? *secondly*, whether a beneficed clerk were capable of temporal jurisdiction, at the time of making that law? *Thirdly*, whether a Bishop, without calling a synod, has power, as diocesan, to convict a heretic? The first of these points he determined in the affirmative; the two latter, in the negative. Intelligence of these learned decisions speedily reached Lambeth; and, as speedily, were reported by the Archbishop to the King. Upon this, the Lord Keeper Finch received immediate orders to interdict the lecturer; and the lecturer lost no time in making application to his Grace, for a revocation of the sentence. Laud, however, was inflexible; and replied that his Majesty was otherwise resolved; and moreover, that "it would have been more prudent in him to have desisted at once, than to have moved his Majesty's royal indignation by that unseasonable adventure." This stern repulse drove the disappointed lawyer from London. But in order that his retreat might have some appearance of a triumph, he was accompanied out of town, with forty or fifty horsemen: a band of brethren assembled to do honour to the victim of prelatical tyranny¹!

While the Archbishop was thus incessantly occupied, for the protection of the Church, he was loudly assailed by the clamours of the seditious, both in England and in Scotland. On the 4th of June, 1639, as he was on his way to the court, to attend upon the Queen, he was met by the Lord Mayor of London;

¹ Heylyn, p. 406—408.

who delivered to him two inflammatory papers ; the one addressed to the Chief Magistrate himself, and to the Aldermen of the City ; the other exciting the apprentices against the Archbishop. Each of these papers was signed by John Lilburn¹, perhaps, the most turbulent and pugnacious individual in England. He was a worthy proficient in the school of Bastwick and Prynne ; and had been concerned in the publication of the "News from Ipswich." For this exploit, he had been condemned by the Star Chamber, to flagellation, to a fine of £500, and to imprisonment in the Fleet. His passion for licentious freedom of speech, and the constancy with which he endured its penalties, had procured for him the title of *free-born John*. And such was his love of strife, that it was said of him, that if he were the only man living, John would quarrel with Lilburn, rather than John Lilburn should be left without a quarrel. The invectives of this man, and of such as he, if not among the causes, were, at least, among the signs, of the approaching ruin of the Archbishop. Laud himself informs us, that "during the whole time, from the publishing of the Service Book to the pacification, he was voiced by the faction, in both nations, to be an incendiary ; a man that laboured to set the two countries in a bloody war²." Among his imputed enormities, was a circular letter, addressed by him to the Bishops, in January, 1639, exhorting them and their clergy to generous contributions towards the necessities of the King, then levying forces for the chastisement of the Scots. The displeasure of the patriots was aggravated by the fact that, through

¹ Diary, p. 56.

² Troubles, &c. p. 75, 76.

the zeal and activity of the Archbishop and his brethren, this application for aid was eminently successful. The prelates were accused of stirring up the Church to prodigal sacrifices, merely for the maintenance of a conflict, which, after all, was nothing more than an *episcopal* war : or which rather might be called a *pontifical* war, seeing that the contributions of the English papists towards its support, were quite as liberal as those of the Protestant dignitaries themselves¹. It was conveniently forgotten that, in despatching the address in question, Laud did but obey an order of the Privy Council ; and that the duty thus imposed upon him was one, which, when once hostilities had been resolved upon, it was impossible for him to decline. He, nevertheless, most solemnly declares, that, previously to this resolution, he had laboured for peace so long and earnestly, that he had often been severely checked for his importunity ; and, more particularly, that when war was spoken of at the Council Table, on the first eruption of the troubles, in 1638, his counsels were in favour of forbearance ; in the hope that the Scots might be prevailed upon to return to their allegiance². The depth and sincerity of his desire for a pacific end to these dissensions, is strongly illustrated by a letter written by him, on the 30th April, 1639, to the Helvetic Pastors and Professors, in answer to an address he had received from them, lamenting the warlike preparations against the Scots. His reply to this address is conceived in a spirit widely abhorrent from the asperity and sternness so frequently ascribed to Laud.

¹ Prynne's Necessary Introduction, &c. p. 175—183. Heylyn, p. 380, 381.

² Troubles, &c. p. 76.

The whole is considerably too long for insertion here. But the following extract will be sufficient to show the temper in which it is composed. Having, first, enlarged on the obduracy of the insurgents, the scandal which their outrageous proceedings might bring upon the name of the Reformation, and the cordial anxiety of the King to conciliate them by all concessions not ruinously inconsistent with his honor,—he continues thus, “you have been prompted by your friendly affection towards our country, (an affection not recently conceived, but derived from your forefathers,) to appeal to me : you adjure me, by all the miseries and perils of intestine war, to consult the peace of my own conscience, and the glory of my name ; and to labour that the quarrel might not be brought to the decision of the sword, but be settled by the authority and the clemency of our King. You implore that I would be pleased to effect all this ! I beseech of you, brethren, to entertain better thoughts concerning me. I protest that, if it depended on my will, the thing would instantly be done. I call God to witness, and his anointed servant our King, and all of his Privy Council who have been present at our deliberations, that, in private, and in public, I have uniformly been the friend of pacific measures. Nay, almost alone and unsupported, I have wrestled with our King, both by arguments and by prayers. And so far did I succeed, that he was prevailed upon, not only once or twice, but repeatedly, to offer to his rebellious people every condition of peace, which a Monarch could honorably concede, or subjects could reasonably or rightfully demand. From them, however, he has been able to obtain nothing. It seems as if the Gorgon’s head had looked upon them, and

turned them into stone. And yet, even now, I desist not from my purpose. My desire, at this moment, is for peace; and so would my voice be also, if our adversaries were not inflexibly set against it. And what, I would ask, in difficulties like these, can be accomplished by my weakness: seeing that we have to do with men that will either have no peace, or such a peace as no kingly Majesty can endure? If, in the mean time, any one has reported me to you, as an enemy to peace, (for I know how inveterately I am hated by each faction,) I beseech of Almighty God to have mercy upon him, and to bestow patience upon me¹."

It must not be forgotten, that these words were addressed by Laud to the Helvetic Churches, with the entire approbation of the King²." They were, in fact, in perfect unison with his own pacific sentiments. It is true, that the indignities heaped upon his authority, at length, awakened him to the necessity of an appeal to arms. And it has been thought by many, that if the royal army had been faithfully conducted, and promptly marched into the heart of the country, the rebellious spirit of the Scots might have been speedily subdued. But the King's merciful and indecisive temper made him averse from all sanguinary extremities. Unfortunately, too, his fondness for magnificence and *feudalism*, betrayed him into the pernicious resolution of calling his nobility about him, to his camp. This was a proceeding, which proved most fatal to his interests, by laying open many of the English Lords to the crafty and seductive representations of the Scots. The end of

¹ Præst. Vir. Epist. No. 552. p. 799.

² Clarend. Papers, vol. ii. p. 35. 37.

these infatuated counsels was, the miserable pacification of June, 1639, which dismissed the rebels without punishment, grievously impaired the honour of his Majesty, discouraged all his truly wise and faithful servants, and imparted confidence to those, who neither loved his person, nor were attached to his service.

The notice of this disgraceful and "hollow truce," in the Diary of the Archbishop, is closed with the following prayer: "God make it safe and honourable to the King and kingdom:" a petition which could hardly have been accomplished, without a miracle! Instead of safety and honour, it produced nothing but disaster and humiliation. The council was involved in perpetual and anxious debate on the most hopeful measures of deliverance. At these deliberations, Laud, of course, assisted. But, again, he protests that no clandestine advice was offered by him to his Sovereign; that his sentiments were always openly delivered by him, in the hearing of his colleagues, at the board; and that his counsels were never more violent than theirs. Still the cry went forth, that he was the grand incendiary, and that all the impending calamities were the result of his overbearing and destructive influence¹. At length, the difficulties began to thicken so rapidly, that the Archbishop joined Lord Strafford, and the Marquess of Hamilton, in proposing that a Parliament should be called, as the only imaginable resource against probable ruin and confusion. At the same time, it was determined, that if, after all, the Commons should prove unmanageable, a resort to

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 78.

unusual means of supply would become inevitable. The language in which this advice is recorded by the Archbishop, was unfortunate enough. "A resolution," he says, "was voted to assist the King, in extraordinary ways, if the Parliament should prove *peevish*, and refuse." These words were afterwards made public, when the Archbishop's private journal was seized, among his other papers, in the Tower: and the unhappy phrase "*peevish*" was, of itself, atrociously treasonable, in the majestic ears of the Long Parliament!

The 13th of April was the day fixed for the meeting of this assembly. No sooner was it opened, than complaints, more loud and tumultuous than ever, were uplifted by the Covenanters, against the Bishops of the Church of England. Religion was on the lips of the fanatics, while treason was in their hearts. It was the very life and soul of their hateful policy, to direct the whole torrent of public execration against the hierarchy. They knew that the Throne would, probably, remain impregnable, so long as the Church retained her authority and strength. And, accordingly, they proclaimed aloud that the Reformed Religion never could be safe, until the dignities of the Church were trampled in the dust. And this nefarious stratagem was adopted by them, with as little remorse, as the men of carnal warfare resort to the countermarch, or the mine, or the ambushade. In the meantime, although the rebellion was becoming, every hour, more fierce and insolent, there appeared no prospect whatever, of any supply for its suppression. At length, Sir Henry Vane, the elder, then Secretary of State, declared, in plain terms, to

his Majesty, that, to his knowledge, it would be idle to hope for any money against the Scots. This information was false, and, most probably, treacherous; and agonizing was the regret of Charles, for having listened to it, in a moment of impatience and precipitancy. The result of it was, that, on the 5th of

1640. May, 1640, the short Parliament, as it was called, was madly and fatally dissolved.

In the resolution for this measure, the dissentient voices were only two; those of the Earls of Northumberland and Holland. It happened, accidentally, that Laud arrived at the board too late to join in the deliberations of the council, and so, cooperated only by his single vote. Nevertheless, the whole guilt of the transaction was heaped upon him. The outcry still was, that the dissolution was his work. The very next day, libels were posted, in various parts of the city, provocative of insurrection. And, on Saturday the 9th of May, a paper was found upon the Old Exchange, inviting the apprentices, with others of the rabble, to assemble in St. George's Fields, "to hunt William, the Fox, for breaking up the Parliament." On the Monday night following, an assault was made on Lambeth Palace by a mob of 500 ruffians, who threatened to tear the Archbishop in pieces. Fortunately, he had received notice of the design, and had fortified the house in a manner sufficient for his protection from personal violence. Such, however, was the fury manifested by the assailants, that, by the King's command, he lodged, for several days and nights after the attack, in the palace at Whitehall. "This scandalous and headless insurrection" was quelled, by the apprehen-

sion and execution of one of the most active ring-leaders, who was hanged and quartered on Saturday, the 23d of May¹.

Previously to the ending of the Parliament, the Convocation had agreed to grant his Majesty six subsidies, amounting, in the whole, to £120,000; but payable in six years, by equal annual portions. Immediately on the dissolution, the Archbishop sent to terminate the Convocation likewise; forgetting, in the haste and agitation of the moment, that the King's writ was requisite, as well for its dissolution, as for its assembling. On being reminded of this, he applied to his Majesty for a writ. To his great surprise, the King signified his pleasure that the Convocation should continue their session; first, in order that they might complete their grant of the six subsidies; and, secondly, that they might finish certain Canons, which were then under consideration. The Archbishop was much perplexed and troubled at this resolution. He had received no previous intimation of it; and he considered both the lawfulness and the expediency of the measure, as extremely questionable. He was, nevertheless, unable to shake the determination of the King; and was compelled to content himself with obtaining his Majesty's consent to have the question submitted to the Lord Keeper, and the Crown Lawyers, for the better assurance and satisfaction of the Clergy. Their answer was, that "the Convocation, being called by the King's writ, under the Great Seal, doth con-

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 79.—Clarendon, vol. i. p. 252, 253. Oxf. Ed.—Diary, p. 59, 60. "My deliverance," says Laud, "was great. God make me thankful for it!"

tinue, until it be dissolved by writ, or commission, under the Great Seal, *notwithstanding the Parliament be dissolved.*" The Convocation continued to sit, accordingly, till the 29th of May. They perfected their Act for the contribution to the King; and they framed seventeen Canons for the better government and peace of the Church. The only dissentient was Dr. Goodman, Bishop of Gloucester, who had long been suspected of a secret inclination to the Romish doctrines; and who, on this occasion, declared to Laud, that he would be torn by wild horses, rather than subscribe the Canon for suppressing the growth of Popery¹. On the first publication of these Canons, they were received with general approbation. Letters were addressed to the Archbishop from the remotest parts of the kingdom, expressive of this sentiment. But, within a little month after they were printed, the London ministers began to whisper against them; then, to clamour loudly; and, lastly, to circulate their complaints in writing: till, at length, this whole body of ordinances was vehemently cried out upon; and, as usual, the main fury of the tempest fell upon the head of the Archbishop.

Of all the proceedings of this Synod, there was none which drew upon the Church a heavier load of obloquy, than the insertion of an oath, which was to be imposed, not only on all the Clergy, but on many of the Laity; and, by which, they were to declare, that they never would consent to any alteration in the government of the Church, by Bishops, Deans,

¹ For this contumacy, he was placed under confinement; but was afterwards released, on his submission. Troubles, &c. p. 79—83. 280—284. Diary, p. 58.

Archdeacons, &c. Every one, in his right senses, must have seen that this *et cetera* had been introduced, solely for the purpose of avoiding a needless enumeration of offices. Nevertheless, an insane, and almost universal outcry was raised against it, by the *agitators* of the day. It was spoken of as a snare and pit-fall. It was denounced, as the entrance into a yawning abyss of perjury. It was held up to universal detestation, under the name of the *et cetera* oath; and, by that name, it has, ever since, been known. But, further, the whole oath itself was furiously censured as “wicked and ungodly;” and was, afterwards, condemned by the Commons, as devised by the Archbishop, for the purpose of “confirming the unlawful and exorbitant power, which had been usurped over his Majesty’s subjects.” It was, lastly, contended, that the imposition of any oath whatever, was an act beyond the legal power of the Convocation. This outcry, though plausible enough, was, purely, the dictate of malignity and faction. For, as Laud affirmed on his trial, even if the law was against the Bishops, on this point, still there were various precedents, hitherto unquestioned, decidedly in their favour: so that, at the very worst, their delinquency amounted to no more than a mistake of the law, and not to a wilful and treasonable violation of it¹. Nevertheless, the attempt was insisted on as conclusive of the malicious and despotic temper which pervaded the whole hierarchy!

The first of the obnoxious Canons was liable to much more formidable objections. It proclaimed

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 280—283.

that Monarchy was of Divine right,—that the royal authority is independent, not only of the Bishop of Rome, but of every other earthly power,—and that it cannot be assailed, on any pretence, without resistance to the ordinance of God. This dangerous doctrine had sometimes been abused by servility and self-interest ; and, at other times, had been too rashly held up, by honest and devoted men, as a barrier against the republican fury of the Puritans. It was now, however, fiercely reprobated, as treason against the majesty of the people ; and it contributed, most powerfully, to place the Archbishop, and his brethren, wholly beyond the pale of public sympathy. And, in truth, it must be allowed that, not only this Canon, but, in some respects, the whole body of them, were of more arbitrary character than would be endured in the present state of our constitution. It must further be admitted, that the time was most unwisely chosen, for so vigorous a display of authority, whether legally warrantable or not. The people were intensely agitated by the sudden dissolution of the Parliament. The nation was threatened with an invasion by the Scots, who were then in treasonable communication with France. A powerful sympathy was in action between the Covenanters of the North, and the most desperate leaders of the faction in the South. The whole condition of the Empire was imminently critical. So that, as Clarendon very justly remarks, “ the season in which that Synod continued to sit, was in so ill a conjuncture of time, that nothing could have been transacted there of a popular and prevailing influence ¹.”

¹ Clarendon, vol. i. p. 360.

One thing, however, may at least be concluded from the tenor of these unpopular ordinances,—it was not a Popish spirit which presided over the assembly by which they were enacted. In the first place, they recommended, indeed, but they did not enjoin, the observance of certain ceremonies, to which the Archbishop was notoriously attached; and they exhorted that all should abstain from uncharitable judgments of each other, touching these outward integuments of Religion. Secondly, one of the most prominent and severe among the Canons was framed “for suppressing the further growth of Popery, and reducing Papists to the Church:” and this Canon was, undoubtedly, the work of the Archbishop¹. It was, consequently, his work, also, that the Romish propensities of Bishop Goodman were detected and exposed. But enough has been seen of the temper of those evil times, to show that the testimony of an Angel from Heaven would, then, scarcely have been sufficient to rescue Laud from the imputation of apostacy.

We are now closely approaching the period of the Archbishop's fall: and he appears, himself, to have been somewhat troubled by certain prognostics of his impending fate. “On the 24th of January,” (he writes in his Diary) “at night, I dreamed that my father, who died forty-six years since, came to me; and, to my thinking, he was as well and as cheerful as ever I saw him. He asked me what I did here. And, after some speech, I asked him, how long he would stay with me? He answered, he would stay with me till he had me away with him. I am not moved with dreams; yet I thought fit to remember this².”

¹ Heylyn, p. 425.

² Diary, p. 57.

It may be doubted whether Laud was not "moved by dreams" rather more than he himself suspected. His Diary abounds in memoranda of these shadowy visitations, to a degree which seems to show that the visions of the night were seldom remembered by him with perfect indifference. The 27th of October, however, was a day of waking augury, with him. "I went," he tells us, "into my upper study, to see some manuscripts, which I was sending to Oxford. In that study hung my picture, taken by the life. And, coming in, I found it fallen down upon the face, and lying on the floor: the string being broken by which it hanged against the wall. I am, almost every day, threatened with my ruin in Parliament. God grant that this be no omen." Now, some weeks previously to this, he had received from a person unknown to him, by the name of Rockel, a letter importing that the writer had been among the Scots, as he was travelling in the North; and that he heard them express their hope, that he, the Archbishop, might come to his end, like the Duke of Buckingham, by the dagger of an assassin; and concluding with advice that he should look well to himself¹. The mind must be of more than ordinary stedfastness, which, either waking or sleeping, can repel the colouring which intimations like this are apt to spread over the imagination. And, here, it must not be forgotten that those very Puritans, who turned such things to the reproach of the Archbishop, were themselves the first to discover the finger of God pointed against him, in every casual occurrence which could, by possibility, be connected with his name. For example:

¹ Diary, p. 58.

it is contemptuously recorded by William Prynne, that the Arch-Prelate took special notice of sundry dreams, presages, and omens of his own downfall: and yet the same William Prynne has been at the pains of adding several to the number. One instance, more especially, he has not been ashamed to borrow from a lying pamphlet, published by the notorious Richard Culmer, entitled "Cathedral News from Canterbury." According to that veracious narrative, much heavy damage was done to the Church by a tempestuous high wind, on the 27th of December, 1639. And this accident, aggravated in all its circumstances by the malicious rhetoric of the author, is joyfully accepted by Prynne, as a miraculous omen from heaven itself, indicating no less than the ruin of the Archbishop, and the destruction of his See; in just retribution for his manifold enormities. This sad omen, he further tells us, was seconded with others, both at Lambeth and Croydon, on that very night. The storm, which had been so prophetic at Canterbury, was equally formidable in the Thames. It made grievous havoc among the boats of the poor watermen at Lambeth: and, moreover, it blew down the shafts of two chimneys at the palace, and, with them, the lead and rafters, upon the bed of one of the Archbishop's servants; who must have perished if he had not accidentally been absent. At Croydon, one of the pinnacles fell from the Church steeple, and beat in a large portion of the lead and roof. "All which," he adds, "compared with the sinking of the Lambeth ferry-boat, with the Archbishop's coach-horses, coach, and men, to the bottom of the Thames, Sept. 18, 1633, the very first day he removed from Fulham to Lambeth-house, was, *no doubt*, an ominous presage of his

own, and his Archbishopric's, sinking, through his pride and violence." Another awful coincidence was, that afterwards, in February, 1642, when the King was at Canterbury, on his way to Dover with the Queen, he affixed his signature to the Act, for depriving the Bishops of their votes in Parliament, at the Abbey of Augustine, *the first Archbishop of that See*. Here, again, the hand of heaven was clearly manifested! For this was the Act, "which unlorded our lordly prelates, and gave them a fatal overthrow, such as struck proud Canterbury dead at heart, and undermined all his prelatical designs to advance the Bishops' pomp and power." The libeller concludes his long catalogue of prognostics with a most egregious falsehood; which, nevertheless, upon the strength of his testimony, was produced against the Archbishop at his trial, like the fall of his picture, "to make a scorn of him to the Lords and the people, and to try whether any thing would break down his patience." It is affirmed by Prynne, that, when Laud was a "scholar at Oxford, he dreamed, one night, that he came to far greater preferment in the Church, and power in the State, than any man of his birth and calling ever did before him; in which greatness and worldly happiness he continued many years; but, after all this happiness, before he awaked, he dreamed that he was hanged. The first part of this dream," continues Prynne, "hath been long since really verified. And the conclusion of it is, in all probability, like to be speedily accomplished, upon the close of his trial." This story of the dream was received by Prynne from a notorious separatist, named Badger, who had married a near kinswoman of the Archbishop's. The whole, however, was an infamous fic-

tion. For Laud declares, upon his Christianity, and hope of salvation, that he "never had this dream, or any like it." But, what if the story were true? What are we to think of a judicial assembly, which would suffer it to be produced in evidence, on a charge of treason, that, forty or fifty years before, the prisoner had dreamed of being hanged¹?

But the hour was now at hand, when the puritanical enemies of Laud were to give a final and terrible interpretation to all these signs and portents, whether earthly or unearthly. In the mean time, he was harassed by fearful presages from another quarter. While the ultra-Protestant faction were rushing on to the assault, the Papists, as usual, were busy in the work of sapping and mining. That they cordially hated the Archbishop, there can be little doubt. The Jesuits were, more especially, inveterate against him; first, because *all* diocesan episcopacy, whether Popish or Protestant, was odious to them; and, secondly, because they found the Primate utterly unmanageable. The King had earned an equal measure of their detestation, by his unassailable fidelity to the Reformed Religion. And it is scarcely doubtful, that they had long employed all the darkest resources of intrigue, to foment the broils which were then distracting Scotland, and to bring on a crisis which might involve both the King and the Archbishop in destruction. But this was not all. On the 10th of September, 1640, Laud received a letter from Sir William Boswell, then his Majesty's resident at the Hague, containing intelligence of a savage plot,

¹ Prynne's Breviat, p. 34, 35. Diary, p. 49. 57. 59. Troubles, p. 409—411. Heylyn, p. 450, 451.

at that moment nearly digested and matured, for the immediate accomplishment of the worst designs of the Popish party. The discovery was made to Sir William Boswell, by one Andreas ab Habernfield, who was said to be a Chaplain to the Queen of Bohemia. This man, it appears, was himself, originally, a party to the whole enterprize; but was impelled, by the reproaches of his conscience, to reveal it to Sir William; having, first, bound him by an oath to communicate it to no one but the Archbishop, and, through him, to the King. According to the statement of Habernfield, the grand patron of this conspiracy was Cardinal Barberini; the principal agent, Con, the papal Nuncio in England; and the operative ministers, the Jesuits. The objects of it were, the complete overthrow of the realm and state of England and of Scotland, and the dethronement of the King; and these by means which would imminently endanger the lives of his Majesty and the Archbishop. On the 11th of October, this alarming intelligence was dispatched by Laud to the King, at York, accompanied by urgent entreaties that the affair might be kept secret, and that his Majesty would not trust his pockets with such dangerous papers; and also by a request for further instructions, as to the prosecution of the business. On the 15th of October, more ample details were transmitted by Sir William Boswell. But these, instead of exciting fresh activity in searching out the plot, were thought by the King and the Archbishop to throw some discredit on the whole relation. Among the persons named as parties to the design were the Duchess of Buckingham, the Countesses of Arundel and of Newport, Montague, Digby, and Winter, of whose fidelity the King was unwill-

ling to entertain suspicion. Besides these, were mentioned the Earl of Arundel; Windebank, the principal Secretary of State, and the intimate friend of Laud; and Endymion Porter, one of the Grooms of the Bed-Chamber: all of whom were denounced as concealed enemies to their Royal Master, and as engaged in a traitorous discovery of his secrets to the Pope's Nuncio. The King's opinion of the loyalty and affection of these individuals caused him to regard the whole narrative with something like incredulous hatred, and to relax in his desire for any further prosecution of the matter¹. With regard to Laud, he was speedily disabled from any further participation in the inquiry. The whole business was examined, at a Committee of Lords, in the presence of the King: but Sir W. Boswell's last communication, in answer to their questions, arrived subsequently to the committal of the Archbishop; so that it was impossible for *him* to continue the investigation². Nevertheless, the transaction must have been sufficient to impress him with a painful suspicion that hidden fires were beneath his feet, while the tempest was loudly raging over his head. And thus

¹ Heylyn, p. 451. 453. The details of this plot are to be found in a tract, entitled "Rome's Masterpiece," printed at the end of Henry Wharton's edition of Laud's History of his Troubles and Trial. This tract, H. Wharton suspects to have been the work of Prynne. It, certainly, is very much in his manner. It is full of invidious commentaries on the conduct of the Archbishop, and complains that there was no prosecution of the conspirators. The papers relative to the plot were found by Prynne in the Archbishop's study, and were printed by order of a committee of the House of Commons.

² Laud's note (c) to "Rome's Masterpiece," p. 596.

much he afterwards expressed, in his Address to the Lords, on the tenth article of his impeachment. "This" he exclaims "is a hard strait into which I am cast. The Pope's agent, as it is said, plots my death, on one side, because I will not be wrought upon to help to bring in the Roman superstition: and the Parliament, on the other side, articles to overthrow me, out of a jealousy that I go about to bring it in. So that I am in the Prophet David's case. (Ps. xxxi.) *For I (also) have heard the blasphemy of the multitude; and fear is on every side: while they conspire against me, and take counsel, to take away my life. But my hope hath been (and is) in thee, O Lord*¹!"

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 163. 385.

CHAPTER VIII.

A.D. 1640—1645.

A Committee of the Long Parliament appointed to prepare charges against Laud—Scottish Articles against him—Impeachment of Laud—His commitment to the Black Rod—Articles of Impeachment—Laud's address to the Lords—His commitment to the Tower—His sufferings during his imprisonment—Additional Articles—His trial and defence—His recapitulation before the Lords—His defence before the Commons—He is condemned by an Ordinance of the two Houses—His behaviour at the scaffold—His execution.

A VARIETY of momentous events, which followed upon the dissolution of the last Parliament, must, here, be hastily passed over. We must confine ourselves (to use the language of Laud himself) to such particulars, as may be needful “to make his sad story hang together¹.”

The invasion of the Scots; the journey of the King to the North; the repetition of his error in once more assembling the Peers at York; the treaty at Rippon; the fatal transfer of the negotiations to London; and the meeting of the revolutionary Parliament; are events familiar to every one tolerably versed in the

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 85.

history of those times. The interval which embraced all these occurrences was marked by various circumstances, which seemed to indicate that the Archbishop, and the Church which he ruled, were doomed to destruction. On the 22nd of August, a libellous paper was found in Covent Garden, exciting not only the apprentices, but the soldiers, to fall upon him, in the absence of the King. On the 22nd of October, a sectarian rabble, chiefly of *Brownists*, or Independents, to the number of 2000, collected round St. Paul's, in which the Court of High Commission then held their session. The tumult speedily became outrageous. The rioters broke in, tore down all the benches in the Consistory, and cried out that they would have no Bishops, and no High Commission¹. "On the 3rd of November the Parliament assembled, with sad and melancholic aspect, which presaged unusual and unnatural events²." On the following day, the Convocation met at St. Paul's. On the 11th, Lord Strafford was impeached. On the 4th of December, the King was prevailed on to make the suicidal concession, that the members of his Privy Council should be examined as witnesses against the Earl. On the 16th of the same month, the Canons, passed in the late Convocation, were condemned in the House of Commons, as contrary to the King's prerogative, to the fundamental Laws of the Realm, and the liberty and property of the subject, and as containing many things which tended to sedition, and were of dangerous consequence.

¹ Diary, p. 59.

² Clarendon, vol. i. p. 295. Oxford edition.

Laud was openly denounced as the author and contriver of this institute of confusion ; and a committee was appointed to examine into his actions, and to prepare a charge against him ¹. On the same day, the vengeance of the Scots appeared embodied in the form of a set of Articles, which their Commissioners presented to the House of Lords ; and in which they challenged the Prelate of Canterbury as the prime cause, on earth, of all the pernicious innovations which had recently been attempted in their country. During his subsequent imprisonment, he employed himself in drawing up an answer to these atrocious charges. One or two passages have already been produced from his noble vindication, in order to illustrate his conduct and his views respecting the Scottish Liturgy and Canons. But they who would form a righteous estimate of the principles and the abilities of Laud, should, undoubtedly, peruse the whole of this appeal to whatever intelligence and justice was still extant among men. It is impossible for any mind, not absolutely deranged by its prejudices, to contemplate this effort, without admiration ; more especially when it is remembered that its author was verging towards his 70th year, when he was thus tied to the stake, to be “ baited with the rabble’s curse.” Every one must surely be struck with his homely, but keen and vigorous, eloquence ; with his profound erudition ; with his consummate mastery over all the topics involved in the accusation ; with the consciousness of integrity which breathes in every line ; with the high-minded scorn

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 86.

which he manifests for the combination of malice and ignorance frequently betrayed in the proceedings of his adversaries ; with the honest indignation with which he hurls back the calumny, that he had acted like a traitor to the religious liberties of England and of Scotland, and that he bore within his bosom the heart of an Apostate. On the 18th of December, after half an hour's debate¹, it was resolved that a message should be sent to the House of Lords, to accuse him of high treason. The speeches which preceded this resolution were outrageously and infamously virulent, more especially that of Sir Harbottle Grimstone ; who described the Archbishop as "the sty of all the pestilential filth which had infested the State and Government of the Commonwealth²." On the same day, Denzil Hollis, the brother-in-law of Strafford, appeared at the bar of the House of Lords, in the name of the Commons of England, to impeach the Archbishop of Canterbury of High Treason. Upon this, he was consigned to the custody of Mr. James Maxwell, the Usher of the Black Rod ; but was first permitted to repair to Lambeth, for the purpose of collecting such papers as might be required for his justification, and of selecting some few books, for his employment and recreation during his confinement³. He remained at Lambeth till the night, in order that he might avoid the intrusion of the gazing populace. In the evening, he attended prayers in his chapel ; where he derived great comfort from the 93d

¹ Clar. vol. i. p. 309. Oxf. Ed.

² Cobbett's State Trials, vol. iv. p. 317.

³ Troubles, &c. p. 144.

and 94th Psalms, and from the 50th chapter of Isaiah, which formed a part of the services of the day : and, assuredly, few portions of Scripture could be found more exactly appropriate to his condition. He afterwards prepared for departure. And, as he was on his way to his barge, he found hundreds of his poor neighbours waiting for him, and praying for his safe return to his own house. Having given them his parting benediction, he embarked for Westminster. These simple particulars are noted in his own Diary; and they prove, beyond all question, his habitual practice of liberality and kindness, and his profound sense of religious consolation in adversity¹.

Whether the Commons were, at this period, intent upon his destruction, it may be difficult to pronounce. He himself, it would appear, was, at one time, under the impression, that his life was not sought. On the second or third day after the meeting of Parliament, he told Heylyn that he should probably be sequestered from his Majesty's Councils, and confined to his own Diocese; professing, at the same time, that he should embrace that retirement quite as willingly as his enemies would inflict it². Something to the same effect was hinted to him on the 21st of January following, by several of the Peers; who stated that the moderation of his demeanour, since his commitment, had been noticed by the upper House, and had considerably abated the edge of their resentment; so that he might pos-

¹ Diary, p. 60. And yet it has recently been affirmed, that Laud could not have been a good man in private life, and that he was destitute of all sense of duty to God or man!

² Heylyn, p. 464.

sibly escape with banishment from Court, and the loss of his Archbishopric. The tender mercies of the wicked, we are told, are cruel. And this seems to have been felt by Laud, on receiving the above most gracious intimation. His reflection upon it is, "I see what justice I may expect. Here is a resolution taken, not only before my answer, but before my charge was brought up against me¹." The probability, however, is, that no decided resolution had been formed, by either House, with respect to the ultimate disposal of their victim. Their more immediate purposes were sufficiently answered by his commitment. The next step was, to get him into the Tower. And, when once there, he might either be left to perish, broken-hearted, in imprisonment; or else, he might be tossed to the Scots, if their vengeance should continue insatiably blood-thirsty. The sequel seems to show that such was, in fact, the tenor of their speculations.

After he was placed in the custody of the Black Rod, all the winds of obloquy were let loose upon him. The Council-chamber, the Star-chamber, the Court of High Commission—all were discovered to have been the scenes of his triumphant iniquity. No complaint could be made, in the upper or the lower House, relative to any place or thing, in which he had ever been concerned, but *he* was found to have been the principal minister of evil. The agents of mischief were unwearied in their search for excitements, by which the hatred of the people might be inflamed to madness. The tumultuous ovation with which Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick, were brought

¹ Diary, p. 60. Troubles, &c. p. 147.

back to London, was the signal for a fresh discharge of all the artillery of popular malice. Ballads and libels were issued, prodigious in multitude, and monstrous in scurrility and falsehood; and all directed against the person and calling of the Archbishop. The lies went forth in swarms, unscared by censure or prohibition from the Parliament; to the scandal of honest men and to the disgrace of a Christian community¹. Indeed, the whole treatment of the Archbishop, from this time to the moment of his death, affords a splendid specimen of the justice and the mercy of revolutionary tribunals. It would seem as if the malice of his assailants, when baffled (as it long was) by the difficulty of finding treasonable matter against him, indemnified itself by calculating on his demolition, at the rate of so many grains a day. The period, for which he remained under the charge of the Gentleman Usher, was no less than ten weeks: and, during the whole of this interval, the fees due to that functionary, together with the expenses of the Archbishop's diet, amounted to twenty nobles a day; making, in the whole, a sum of £436 and upwards; all of which was received by the head Lictor, without the abatement of a single penny². We learn from Heylyn, that, during his confinement at Mr. Maxwell's, his
gentle and patient demeanour so completely won for him the good opinion of the gentlewoman of the house,

1641.

¹ Many of the libels vented against Laud, after his imprisonment, are still preserved in the "Collection of Pamphlets," in the British Museum, 4to, 1640—1645. Those of them which I have seen, are as dull and stupid as they are scurrilous. One of them, with most impudent mendacity, charges him with promoting dunces and profligates!

² Troubles, &c. p. 145, 146.

that she reported of him to her companions, that, although he was but a silly fellow to hold converse with a lady, he was the most excellent and pious soul she had ever met with. But he was now about to appear once more, before an assembly, who were unwilling to give him credit for a single virtue. On the 26th of February, 1641, the articles of impeachment were brought up from the Commons to the Lords: and, thereupon, a vote was passed for transferring him to the Tower. The Archbishop was then ordered to attend the House; and there the Articles were read to him, at the bar. They were fourteen in number. It would be tedious and unnecessary to recite them at full length. Their substance is as follows:—

1. That the Archbishop had traitorously endeavoured to subvert the fundamental laws of the Realm, and to persuade the King that he might levy money, without the consent of Parliament.

2. That he had encouraged sermons and publications tending to the establishment of arbitrary power.

3. That he had interrupted and perverted the course of justice at Westminster Hall.

4. That he had traitorously and corruptly sold justice: and advised the King to sell judicial and other offices.

5. That he had surreptitiously caused a pernicious Book of Canons to be published without lawful authority; and had unlawfully enforced subscription to it.

6. That he had assumed a Papal and tyrannical power, both in ecclesiastical and temporal matters.

7. That he had laboured to subvert God's true religion, and to introduce Popish superstition and idolatry.

8. That he had usurped the nomination to many ecclesiastical benefices, and had promoted none but persons who were Popishly affected, or otherwise unsound in doctrine, or corrupt in manners.

9. That he had committed the licensing of Books to Chaplains notoriously disaffected to the Reformed religion.

10. That he had endeavoured to reconcile the Church of England to the Church of Rome; had held intelligence with Jesuits and the Pope; and had permitted a Popish hierarchy to be established in this kingdom.

11. That he had silenced many godly ministers; hindered the preaching of God's word; cherished profaneness and ignorance; and caused many of the King's subjects to forsake the country.

12. That he had endeavoured to raise discord between the Church of England, and other Reformed Churches; and had oppressed the Dutch and French congregations in England.

13. That he had laboured to introduce innovations in religion and government, into the kingdom of Scotland; and to stir up war between the two countries.

14. That to preserve himself from being questioned for these traitorous practices, he had laboured to divert the ancient course of Parliamentary proceeding, and to incense the King against all Parliaments¹.

Such were the treasons gravely and solemnly imputed by the Commons of England to Archbishop Laud! When the articles had been read, he obtained

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 150—173.

permission to speak a few words to their Lordships ; and immediately addressed them to the following effect : His charge—he said—was great and heavy. He should, indeed, be unworthy to live, if it could be made good. It denounced him as an enemy to God, in point of religion ; to the King, in point of allegiance ; to the public, in point of safety. The king, it was true, was but little named in the impeachment : but, he held the civil and political union of king and people to be so intimate, that no man could be faithful to the one, and yet treacherous to the other. Heavy, however, as his accusation was, he was unable, as yet, correctly to estimate the entire weight of it. At present, it dealt merely in general charges. But he trusted, that, when his accusers should enter into proof of each particular complaint, his innocence would furnish him with a sufficient answer. He might, indeed, have fallen into errors ; but these, he hoped, would meet with an indulgent construction from their lordships. The affairs which had passed through his hands had been of great variety and moment ; such as might easily betray far abler men than himself, into occasional mistake. With regard to the charge of corruption in his office, he blessed God that he feared no accuser that would speak the truth. But that which moved him most, was, that he should be deemed foul and false in the profession of his religion ; that he should be thought to have his heart at Rome, while his lips were with the Church of England ; that he should be suspected of labouring, with secret and treacherous craft, to bring back the superstitions of Rome upon his country. This, he confessed, did most exceedingly trouble him. And if he should chance to forget himself, and

fall into passion when speaking of it, his case would but resemble that of St. Jerome, who declared that he knew not how to be patient, when arraigned of falsehood in Religion; and this was said by Jerome upon infinitely less provocation than that which was now laid upon *him*; for he (the Archbishop) was charged, not only with the baseness of personal defection, but with a design to involve the whole nation in apostacy. He then proceeded to enlarge upon those parts of the impeachment, which contained this falsehood¹; and so, concluded an address, which ought to have covered his accusers with confusion.

On the petition of the Archbishop, his transfer to the Tower was postponed till the following Monday, the 1st of March, in order that there might be sufficient time for the preparation of his lodging. On that day, he was conveyed, at noon, by Mr. Maxwell, in his coach, to the place of his long and last imprisonment. His passage was free from insult or disturbance, till he had passed Newgate-street, and entered into Cheapside. At that spot, a clamour was commenced by one or two apprentices. The tumult grew louder and fiercer every instant. By the time he had reached the Exchange, it became outrageous. And it followed him, (as he himself complains,) "beyond barbarity itself," even to the very gates of the Tower. Mr. Maxwell, to his credit, was moved with grief and indignation, at this outbreking of brutality. But the patience of Laud was not discomposed for a moment. "I looked" he

¹ Troubles, &c. 159—163.

says, "upon a higher cause, than the tongues of Shimei and his children ¹."

The very day of Laud's commitment to the Tower was rendered memorable by another formidable sign of the times. A committee of religion was nominated in the House of Peers: to consist of ten Earls, ten Barons, and ten Bishops. Of this body of reformers, Bishop Williams was the chairman. In the preceding year, he had been released from the Tower, and restored to his place in the House of Lords. And now we find him content to preside over an assembly, in which the votes of the Laity outnumbered those of the Clergy, in the proportion of two to one; and whose office was to inquire into all innovations in doctrine and discipline, since the reformation. By Laud, the appointment of this conclave was regarded, from the first, as pregnant with danger and dishonour to the Church and State. His presages were defeated only by the impetuous progress of still more calamitous and revolutionary designs. In the May following, the committee was thrown into a state of discord and confusion, by the recent introduction of a bill for the abolition of Deans and Chapters. Their deliberations were, consequently, broken up; and the whole project ended in a mere abortion ².

Soon after the Archbishop's commitment to the Tower, the work of vengeance and confiscation went vigorously forward. An order was issued for com-

¹ Troubles, &c.. p. 147.

² Diary, p. 62.—Troubles, &c. p. 174, 175.—Heylyn, p. 472—475.

pensation to Prynne and his brother incendiaries. An assessment was accordingly made, of sixteen thousand pounds, on the estates of the Archbishop, and his colleagues of the Star-chamber ; of which sum, £6,000 was awarded to Burton ; and £5000 each, to Prynne and Bastwick ; of which, however, Prynne afterwards declared that he never received one farthing. A fine of £20,000 was, moreover, imposed on the Archbishop, for his share in the proceedings of the late Convocation. In other respects, too, it will appear that he was treated like one whose guilt had already been established. In the midst of the insults now heaped upon him, he had the comfort of receiving a visit of condolence from the celebrated Pococke ; who had been employed by him to collect manuscripts abroad, with a view to the advancement of oriental literature at Oxford. A twelvemonth before, he had written to Pococke, to apprise him that he was then about to settle the Arabic Lecture, for ever, on the University ; and he added, "I would have your name on the deed, which is the best honour I can do to the service." And this settlement he actually made in June, 1641. Foreseeing the tempest which was gathering, he sent to Oxford a grant of one-fifth part of his lands at Bray, in Berkshire, for the perpetual endowment of the Lectureship ; and, in the November following, he despatched thither an additional collection of manuscripts, together with a letter deploring the iniquity of the times. The first thought of Pococke, on his return to England, in March, 1641, was to pay his grateful and sorrowful respects to his imprisoned patron. The Archbishop seized this opportunity to declare, that, among the bitterest of his afflictions, he reckoned his inability to testify his

esteem for Pococke, by offering him the preferment, which he had intended, and which he considered as justly due to the eminent merits of this great scholar. After some further converse, Pococke delivered to him a message from Hugo Grotius, (then a fugitive, at Paris, from the persecutions of the Calvinists,) by which he urgently besought the Archbishop to follow his example, and to seek safety in flight, until the present tyranny should be overpast. The Lord Keeper, and Secretary Windebank, had thus provided for their security. But Laud inflexibly refused this counsel. "An escape"—he said,—“is feasible enough. Yea, it is, I believe, the very thing my enemies desire. For, every day, an opportunity for it is presented; a passage being left free, in all likelihood for this purpose, that I should endeavour to take advantage of it. But they shall not be gratified by me. I am almost seventy years old. Shall I now go about to prolong a miserable life, by the trouble and the shame of flying? Should I go to France, or any other Popish country, it would give some seeming grounds for that charge of Popery, which they have endeavoured, with so much industry, and so little reason, to fasten upon me. But if I should get into Holland, I should expose myself to the insults of those sectaries there, to whom my character is odious; and have every Anabaptist come and pluck me by the beard. No: I am resolved not to think of flight; but patiently to expect and bear what a good and wise Providence hath provided for me, of what kind soever it shall be¹.”

Of the doom which awaited him, he speedily re-

¹ Twells' Life of Pococke, p. 74, &c. Ed. 1816.

ceived a mournful warning, in the trial and execution of his illustrious friend the Earl of Strafford. The royal master of Laud, in the hour of agony which extorted his consent to the sacrifice of that Earl, needed the presence of an inflexible and courageous counsellor, who would loudly protest against the abandonment of a devoted and heroic servant; one who would not, like Williams, tell his sovereign that he had a private conscience, and a public conscience; and that, on matters of public import, he was at liberty to consult the one, and disregard the other. This service, the adamant integrity of Laud might have rendered to his master, in that hour of darkness. But the children of disobedience had been wise in their generation. They had felt how expedient it was to deprive the King's unsteady mind of all firm support; and, accordingly, Laud was then in the Tower, instead of being at the council table of his sovereign.

On the night previous to his execution, Strafford urgently requested the Lieutenant of the Tower to allow him an interview with the Archbishop; offering that it should be in the presence of the Lieutenant himself, "so that he might hear all that should pass between them: for," said he, "it is no time now, for him to plot *heresy*, or for me to plot *treason*." The Lieutenant alleged that his orders were peremptory against it; and that the indulgence could only be obtained by a petition to the Parliament. "No," replied Strafford, "I have gotten my despatch from them, and will trouble them no more. I am, now, petitioning a higher court; where neither partiality can be expected, nor error feared." He then turned to the primate of Ireland, who had been permitted to

attend him, and said, "I will tell you what I should have spoken to my Lord's Grace of Canterbury. You shall desire the Archbishop to lend me his prayers, when I do go abroad to-morrow; and that he will be in his window, that by my last farewell I may give him thanks for this, and all his former favours." The Archbishop, on hearing this message, replied that he was bound, by every obligation of conscience and affection, to comply with the request: but feared that his weakness and passion would not lend him eyes to behold the departure of his friend. The next morning, when Strafford was on his way to the scaffold, as he approached the lodgings of the Archbishop, he remarked that he did not see his Grace; but, nevertheless, requested permission to do his last observance towards his chamber. In the mean time, the Archbishop, being apprised of the approach of Strafford, appeared at the window. Upon which, the Earl, bowing himself to the ground, exclaimed, "My Lord, your prayers, and your blessing." Laud immediately lifted up his hands, pronounced his parting benediction, and then instantly fell back, fainting under the anguish of that bitter moment. The last words of Strafford to him, were, "Farewell, my Lord; may God protect your innocence." The Archbishop, it seems, was almost ashamed of having sunk under the pressure of his feelings. He was fearful lest it should be ascribed to effeminate weakness of spirit. And, therefore, when he had recovered himself, he expressed a hope, (which was amply and nobly justified by the event,) that his own fate would be found to move him less, than the execution of his friend. And good reason there was, he added, that it should be so. For

neither he, nor any other Churchman, had ever rendered such services to the Church as the Earl of Strafford¹.

In addition to this recital of the last moments of Strafford, it should be stated, that, although no intercourse between them had been permitted, in the Tower, the Lieutenant, Sir William Balfore, had reported to Laud the frequent expressions of affectionate reverence towards him, to which the Earl had given utterance. These circumstances are sufficient to expose the turpitude of those falsehoods, which were industriously circulated to the last, for the purpose of exasperating the populace against Laud. It was very generally and confidently affirmed, that when the day of Strafford's execution was approaching, he had broken out into passionate exclamations against the Archbishop; had declared that Laud, and his counsels, had been the ruin of his house; and had vented his resentment and remorse in bitter execrations². The folly of such reports was at least equal to their malignity. In the first place, they who knew any thing of the Earl, must also have known, that he was not a man to be seduced, to his destruction, by the counsels of an inferior mind. And it may be said, without any invidious disparagement of Laud, or of any other man of his day, that it would have been difficult to name a mind which was not inferior to that of Strafford. Besides, it is fully manifest, from the whole extant correspondence between them, that Strafford's estimate of Laud was, always, high and honourable. The ecclesiastic is, uniformly, addressed by the statesman, in language of the most

¹ Heylyn, p. 280.

² Troubles, &c. p. 179.

cordial veneration and attachment. In the Archbishop, Strafford found a spirit exactly congenial with his own. The result of this similarity, was an inviolable friendship, which kept them in steady co-operation, for the service of the crown, and the safety of the Chnrch. The adherence of Laud to Buckingham has been thought, by some, to have too much resembled the fidelity of an adventurer to his patron. But, be this as it may, his league with Wentworth was, evidently, the union of two loyal and devoted hearts.

No sooner was Strafford in the dust, than the whole brood of libellers, who had pursued him even to death, turned their undivided rancour against the surviving partner of his counsels! Every street rung with ballads, every wall was pasted with lampoons, of which the Archbishop was the subject. Base pictures were made, in which he was represented as confined in a cage; or fastened to a post, with a chain round his neck. The taverns and the ale-houses echoed with the ribald merriment of revelers, "who were as drunk with malice as with liquor," and who had been taught to execrate him as a common enemy¹. But, the outcry was not heard among the rabble of London only. It was taken up by the townsmen of Oxford. They actually sent up a petition to the House of Lords, in which they accused the Chancellor of the University of treason, for presuming to regulate the market, by a proclamation in his own name! From the days of Edward the Third, to the hour in which the petition was signed, the same had been the frequent practice of the Chan-

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 180.

cellors. And, besides, if this were treason, the Lord Mayor of London must, immemorially, have been almost a traitor *ex officio*; for the daily edicts of that Magistrate bear no other name but his. The stupidity of the charge was so completely exposed by Laud, that nothing more was heard of it¹. Having disposed of this affair, he proceeded to execute the resolution he had, for some time, formed, of resigning the office of Chancellor: and, accordingly, with the consent of his Majesty, he addressed a letter to the University on the 28th of June, 1641; in which, after describing the misery and helplessness of his present condition, and expressing a hope that they, at least, would do justice to his memory, he added, that when he first was invested with the honour of being their Chancellor, he intended to carry it with him to his grave; but, that, finding the parliament were pleased to procrastinate his trial, he resigned his office, as thankfully as he had received it. He concluded by entreating them to elect some *honourable person*, who, upon all occasions, might be ready to serve them. And he besought God to send them such a one, as might do all things for his glory, and the furtherance of their most famous University².

The "honourable person" chosen to succeed Archbishop Laud, was Philip Earl of Pembroke, who had long been impatient for the distinction. In his youth he was known for a courtier and a sportsman. In mature life, he was destitute of all credit and influence, either in the parliament or the country. His understanding was mean, his spirit malicious, base, and dastardly. From the first moment of Laud's

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 181.

² Laud's Remains, vol. ii. p. 217.

adversity, he never ceased to pursue him with clamour and detraction. And, in 1647, he crowned his infamy, by betraying the rights and privileges which he was solemnly sworn to defend, and by joining the fanatics in their abortive attempt to force the covenant upon the University¹. And this was the man, who, by the choice of a great and learned body, was to supply the place of the munificent patron of their literature, and the devoted guardian of their honour!

On the 23rd of September, the Archbishop had the misfortune to lose an old and faithful domestic, Adam Torless, who had served him with devoted attachment, for two and forty years; during the latter part of which he had discharged the office of steward with exemplary care and integrity. His death was lamented by Laud, as a heavy addition to the load of his calamities. He felt as if he had lost a friend, who was the only comfort left him in his affliction and old age². The next ingredient in his cup of bitterness, was the sequestration of his jurisdiction and patronage, by an order of the House of Lords, dated 23rd of October, 1641. The interdict was to continue until he should be either convicted or acquitted of high treason. During the interval, his authority was to be exercised by his inferior officers; and his nomination to preferments subject to the approbation of the House. And this, as Laud observes, was the work of men who were eternally clamouring against arbitrary government³. But he had, now, unhappily, an enemy among the Peers, in Bishop

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 181.—Clarendon, vol. i. p. 105.—vol. v. p. 72, 73. 431, 432. Oxf. ed.

² Troubles, &c. p. 182.

³ Ibid, p. 103.

Williams ; who had brought back with him, from the Tower, a bitter and vindictive mind. His first performance, after his release, was to support and vindicate Lord Say, a notorious enemy to the Church, when he had uttered a rancorous invective against the imprisoned Prelate. On that occasion, Williams rose in his place, and declared "that he had long known the noble Lord, and had always believed him to be as well affected to the Church, as himself." He afterwards professed the most cordial devotion to the service of the King : and, in a sermon preached by him, as Dean of Westminster, protested that the Presbyterian discipline was a government fit only for shoemakers and tailors, and not for noblemen and gentlemen¹. And yet he was now prepared to insult and afflict the Church, in the person of his fallen adversary. It was chiefly at the instigation of Williams that this order of sequestration was agreed to in the House of Peers : an order, which consigned the powers of the Primate of all England to obscure officials ; and virtually placed his patronage at the disposal of men who, day and night, were plotting the subversion of Episcopacy. But, it seems as if the eye of a retributive Providence was fixed upon his baseness. For, on the 30th of December following, this same man, then Archbishop of York, found himself, once more, an inhabitant of the Tower ; to which he was consigned by that very faction, to whose flagitious craft he had shown himself so subservient a minister.

The occasion which brought him there, is well known. He had prevailed upon eleven of his bre-

¹ Clarendon, vol. ii. p. 109, 110. Oxf. ed.

thren to join him in a protest against the validity of every act of the House of Lords, passed since the 27th of December, 1641 ; on which day the Bishops had been forcibly shut out from attendance on their duty there, by the outrageous violence of the rabble. The revolutionary party rejoiced in this paroxysm of rashness ; and, incontinently, committed the protesting Prelates to the Tower, as *traitors!* It was remarked by a member of the House of Commons, that it would have been more “germane to the matter,” to have committed them to Bedlam, as lunatics. And, indeed, it scarcely can be doubted, that this wild exploit of Archbishop Williams contributed, materially, to accelerate the downfall of the Church.

1642. The year 1642 commenced without any preparation for the trial of the Archbishop. Nevertheless, the spirit of revenge and persecution did not linger. The limits of this work, however, forbid us to detail all the cowardly vexations heaped upon him, during his long imprisonment. Our readers must be content with a selection. On the 15th of May, he was able to go to Church, for the first time after a rupture of the tendon of his right leg, which had happened about six weeks before. The person appointed to preach before him was one Mr. Jocelin ; who seems to have imagined himself invested with more than the prerogatives of an ancient prophet. His text was from Judges v. 23. *Curse ye Meroz, &c.* and he abused the words of Scripture in a manner which Pym and Vane might have listened to with rapture. He made his sermon the vehicle of such coarse and virulent invective against the Archbishop, that the women and the boys stood up in the Church, to see how he could endure it. But his patience remained

unshaken ; and he prayed that the malice might be forgiven ¹.

On the 19th of August, an order, which had been made by the Lords, for seizing whatever arms might be found at Lambeth Palace, was put in execution. The messengers remained all night in the house. They searched every room. They broke open every door, if the key could not instantly be found. The spoils were carried through the city, amid the execrations of the mob. And it was given out that the Archbishop of Canterbury was provided with arms sufficient for ten thousand men. In fact, there were scarcely sufficient for two hundred : and these had been purchased by Laud from the executors of that idol of the Puritans, Archbishop Abbot! On the 9th of November, another search was made, not for steel, but for gold, by two members of the House of Commons, attended by a file of musqueteers. The sum of £78 was taken away, "for the maintenance of the King's children." "God, in his mercy," exclaims Laud, "look favourably upon the King, and bless his children from needing any such poor maintenance!"

On the 23rd of December, Leighton, the fanatic who had lost his ears, appeared at Lambeth, with a warrant from the Honorable House of Commons, to prepare the palace for the reception of prisoners. The selection of this man for the purpose was another proof that the party were resolved, if possible, to "break down the patience" of their prisoner. In this, their malice was egregiously baffled and defeated. They persevered, however ; and, in a few months

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 196.

more, *Lambeth palace* became *Lambeth jail*; and Leighton was appointed jailor¹.

1643. On the 1st of May, 1643, a motion was made in the House of Commons, chiefly by the contrivance of that rabid fanatic, Hugh Peters, for the transportation of the Archbishop of Canterbury, unheard and untried, to the Colony of New England; where he would find himself in the midst of sectarians, to whom it would be almost as the breath of life, to triumph in the calamity and disgrace of an exiled Prelate. But, either this monstrous proposal was too much even for the iniquity of the Long Parliament; or else, it was resolved that his enemies, at home, should be gratified with the spectacle of his destruction. The motion, accordingly, was lost; but the faction, nevertheless, continued to pour out the phials of their wrath, at intervals, upon his head, in order that the poor remnant of his life, in this country, might be as wretched as brutal malignity could make it. His goods were sold, for a third part of their value. He was restrained from quitting his lodging without the presence of a keeper, even for the purpose of needful air and exercise. He was reduced to such indigence, by the sequestration of his property, that he was compelled to petition the Lords that something might be allowed him out of his estate, to supply the necessities of life, and that he might not be suffered either to beg or starve. The reply to this application was, that he must instantly bestow the vacant

¹ It has been said that Leighton's wits were unsettled by the hardships of his imprisonment. If so, the Parliament thought fit to entrust a lunatic with the custody of a prison!

benefice of Chartham, not according to the wishes of the King, but according to the order of the House ; and that, if he should refuse, he must expect no allowance whatever for his support. At length, he was consigned to the hands of his inveterate adversary, William Prynne. That worthy minister of revolutionary vengeance repaired to the Tower, on the 31st of May, armed with full powers to search and seize. That he should carry with him to the execution of this office, some feelings of bitterness against the man, whom he regarded as the principal author of his mutilation, might, reasonably enough, have been expected. But, on this occasion, he demeaned himself, not only like an enemy, but like a shameless villain. He found the Archbishop in his bed ; and immediately began to ransack his pockets. He then laid hands on a mass of papers, which Laud had prepared for his defence ; on two letters from the King, relative to Chartham and his other benefices ; on his Scottish Service Book, with such directions as were attached to it ; on his Diary, in which he had briefly noted all the occurrences of his life ; and he did not even spare the Archbishop's Book of Private Devotions. All the money that he discovered, was about £40 ; and this he was graciously pleased to leave untouched ; for revenge, and not gold, was his object : and, speedily afterwards, it was proclaimed from the Pulpit, that great and fearful things had been discovered, in this search, which would soon be brought to light. On the 10th of June, an ordinance was passed, for a complete sequestration of the temporalities of the See, and for transferring the patronage to the Lords and Commons ; by virtue of which, their own nominee,

Corbet, was instituted to the rectory of Chartham. This ordinance, which was designed for the bitterest of humiliations, was accepted by Laud as the greatest favour he could receive at their hand : for it relieved him from the vexation and the sin of admitting unworthy persons to the service of the Church, and left the responsibility to his persecutors. In order that the prisoner might not be left without spiritual edification, under all these trials, one of the apostles of Christian liberty appeared in the pulpit of the Tower Church, on Sunday, the 20th of August, in a buff coat and scarf, over which it was his pleasure to wear a gown. His name was Kem, Vicar of Low Leighton, and Captain of a troop of horse! He exhorted the people to be of good courage; and proclaimed the certain beatitude of all who should die in the good and holy cause.

The Archbishop had now been languishing in prison for nearly three years; neglected, but not forgotten. The whole of this interval was disastrously memorable. The work of demolition had been advancing with gigantic strides. The Prelates, who had, most unworthily, withdrawn from their judicial functions, when Strafford was impeached, soon found the reward which villainy has in store for cowardice. The most desperate of the destructive party, the root and branch reformers, persuaded Sir Edward Dering to bring forward their Bill for the extirpation of Bishops, Deans and Chapters, and all ecclesiastical dignities connected with them. He seized the axe; he struck the first blow at the cedars of Lebanon, and, more especially, at the tallest among them, the Primate of all England. Like Judas, he repented of his treachery, when it

was too late; and, like him, he was greeted by his impenitent confederates in evil: *What is that to us; see thou to that.* This attempt was speedily followed by the destruction of the High Commission Court; and, with it, of the Church's salutary discipline. Then came the insane crusade against the altars, and the painted windows, and all the external monuments and attributes of holiness; the incessant hammering and forging of petitions against Episcopacy, suited to every degree and type of vulgar insolence and folly; the infamous and tyrannical suppression of those better feelings, which, occasionally, revolted against these atrocities; the extinction of the right of the Bishops to vote in the House of Lords; the final manifesto of rebellion, in the shape of a remonstrance to the King; the establishment of an inquisition, for the reception of complaints against all *scandalous* and *malignant* ministers; and, lastly, the convocation of the Assembly of Divines. In short, a many-headed despotism had been set up, compared with which, the abuses of the Prerogative, and the excesses of the Star-chamber and the High Commission, were like mercy and loving-kindness. If the monarchy and the Church had ever chastised the kingdom with whips, the assailants of the monarchy and the Church were, now, chastising it with scorpions.

During the whole of this period, the malice of Prynne against the Archbishop, had scarcely slept for a moment. Like a staunch and sagacious bloodhound, he had been almost incessantly on the quest. But, with all his keenness and perseverance, he had still been grievously at fault. His wishes, indeed, had been swift to shed blood. But the scent lay so

dull and cold, that his steps were tediously slow. Any thing but revolutionary malice would have been baffled and reduced to despair. At length, it became necessary that something effectual should be done, as Ludlow remarks, "for the encouragement of the Scots." On the 25th of September, the covenant was taken, in St. Margaret's Church, by the House of Commons, and the Assembly of Divines. On the 27th, it was administered, with no less solemnity, to many of the lords, and knights, and gentlemen, and soldiers, residing in, or near, the city of London. As if this potion had infused new life into the veins of persecution, on the 23rd of October ten new Articles were brought forward. The original impeachment had been most amply garnished with matters of religion: for religion was the only stimulant, of potency sufficient to maintain the exasperation of the people against their victim. The expedient had been tolerably successful. Nevertheless, the interval had been employed, with desperate industry, in making a fresh collection of fragments; and these were now produced, in order to whet the almost blunted appetite of the populace, and to prepare them for the approaching sacrifice. The following is the substance of those additional Articles:

1. That the Archbishop had caused the dissolution of the Parliaments held in the 3rd and 4th years of the King.

2. That he had laboured to advance the authority of the Church, and the prerogative of the King, above the law.

3. That he had procured a stop to his majesty's writs of prohibition.

4. That he had caused execution of judgment to be staid, in favour of a Clergyman, charged with non-residence.

5. That he had imprisoned Sir John Corbet, for causing the Petition of Right to be read at the Quarter Sessions.

6. That he had suppressed the Corporation of Feoffees, for buying impropriations.

7. That he had harboured several Popish Priests.

8. That he had averred that the Church could never be brought to conformity, without a severer blow than had yet been struck.

9. That he had introduced an unlawful oath into the Canons.

10. That he had recommended extraordinary ways of supply, if the Parliament should prove *peevish*.

On the 24th of October, the Archbishop received an order to make his answer, in writing, by the 30th of the same month. He petitioned for further time; and it was granted. He also requested the restoration of his papers. He was informed that he might have copies of them; but at his own charge. They had laid their hands on his estate, and had sold his goods: and now they brutally mocked him with the answer, that he must pay for the transcription of a voluminous mass of his own manuscripts; three bundles of which, out of twenty-one, were all that had ever been returned to him by Prynne, notwithstanding the most solemn promise of speedy restoration. The Archbishop was thus placed absolutely at the mercy of his enemies. His persecutor was, now, at liberty to produce whatever might seem to strengthen the impeachment; to suppress every

syllable that might be needful for the purposes of vindication; and, in short, to embezzle and to garble, according to the shameful exigences of his cause. And remorseless was the villainy with which he used this most iniquitous advantage. Laud, then, desired that he might be supplied with funds, sufficient for retaining of counsel. But he was apprized that he must expect no funds from them; and that he, the Archbishop of Canterbury, might proceed *in formá pauperis!* It is impossible to relate, at length, the tale of vexation and delay which followed these oppressions. Whitelock was the person who was first thought of, as conductor of the evidence. But Whitelock remembered the kindness and encouragement he had experienced from Laud, while prosecuting his studies at Oxford: and he recoiled from an office which must have branded him, for ever, with the infamy of treacherous ingratitude. Upon this, the indefatigable vengeance of Prynne was employed to put together the pieces of "this broken business;" of Prynne, who, notoriously, "kept a school of instruction for the preparation of the witnesses, wherein his tampering was so palpable and foul," that a barrister of credit, who was a stranger to Laud, declared that "he could not but pity him, and cry shame upon it!" It is evident that, by this time, the hatred of his enemies was heightened to desperation. Whatever might be his virtues, it was needful for their interests, and even for their safety, that he should be made a criminal. So atrocious were the wrongs he had already endured, and those which he foresaw would thicken upon him, that his spirit was well nigh sinking under the weight of this most odious conspiracy. This despondency, however,

he speedily shook off; and fixed his hopes, under God, upon the honour and justice of the Lords. The trial came; and then it was apparent that, to rely on their integrity, would be to lean on the staff of a broken reed. The following statement must fix indelible dishonour on the names of those who formed the tribunal which condemned him. "It did trouble me," he says, "to see so few Lords in that great House. For, at the greatest presence that was, any day of my hearing, there were not above fourteen; and, usually, not above eleven or twelve. Of these, one-third, each day, took or had occasion, to depart before the charge of the day was half given. *I never had, any one day, the same Lords all the morning.* Some leading Lords were scarcely present at my charge *four days* of all my long trial, or *three* at my defence. And, which is worst, *no one Lord was present at my whole trial*, but the Lord Gray of Wark, the Speaker!"

It was not till the 12th of March, 1644, that the process commenced. The Scots had entered the kingdom in the preceding January. It then became needful that the preparations should be vigorously expedited. Nevertheless, in spite of all his cordial diligence, nearly two months elapsed before Prynne could be ready to let slip his satellites. The business began with a speech from Sergeant Wilde; who proclaimed that an atrocity was now brought to light, such as no poet could feign, no actor represent, no mimic imitate¹. The following is the manner in which the trial was conducted. When the hearing came on, each day, the charge against the

¹ Cobb. State Trials, vol. iv. p. 353.

prisoner usually lasted till two o'clock. He was allowed till four only, to prepare his answer,—scarcely time enough even to peruse the evidence: and his counsel were not permitted to come to him, till after his answer had been made. His witnesses were not allowed to be sworn; and, after his answer, one or more of the committee replied upon him. By this time, it was, generally, about half-past seven: and then, weary and exhausted, and with his clothes ringing with perspiration, he was obliged to go back in the evening by water, to the Tower. Such was the treatment of the Primate of all England before the assembly of his Peers; and this, too, when he was bowing with age and infirmity, and worn down with a life of anxiety and toil. It is perfectly astonishing that he was not crushed, long before the conclusion of the whole proceedings; which were not finally closed until the following November. But his mighty spirit bore him bravely and stiffly up, under all hardships and indignities: and, he says himself, “I humbly thank God, He so preserved my health, that I never had so much as half an hour’s head-ache, or other infirmity, all the time of this comfortless and tedious trial¹.”

Nothing could be more vain than to attempt an abridgment of the “tedious trial.” No art of condensation could exhibit, within the compass of a few pages, the substance of a narrative, which, at full length, would occupy a very considerable volume².

¹ Nearly all the foregoing particulars, relative to the treatment of Laud, after his commitment to the Tower, are to be found in his own History of his Troubles and Trial, p. 148—216.

² It actually does occupy 223 folio pages of the Archbishop’s History of his Troubles; including the period from the first day

Some notice of the more momentous delinquencies imputed to the Archbishop, and of the manner of his reply to the charges, has been, occasionally, introduced in the course of the foregoing history of his life. And this mode has been adopted, in order that the reader might be better able to form a judgment, respecting the merits or demerits of certain parts of his conduct, while the particulars of each transaction were fresh in his recollection. Any further remarks which may appear to be required, will be reserved for the following chapter; in which, some estimate will be attempted, of his personal character, and of the principles which governed his administration. In the mean time, it may be sufficient to state, that, in order to prove him a satellite of Popery, his prosecutors ripped up his whole life, from his admission at Oxford to his commitment to the Tower. The painted windows, the communion-table placed against the wall, the obeisance towards it on entering the church, the ceremonies of consecration, the promotion of men who disapproved the theology and discipline of Geneva, the alleged partiality of his *Arminian* licensers, some courtesy and protection which he had shown to a Popish priest or two, as his predecessors had done before him,—these, and a multitude of other matters, had been diligently swept together, to show that he had been, all his days, in deep collusion with the Vatican. To prove that he was bent on the destruction of the reformed faith, the books of the Star-Chamber, the High Commission, his own Registries, and the Registries of Oxford and Cambridge,

of his hearing, the 12th of March 1644, to the 3rd of January 1645, when he received the intelligence that the bill of attainder had passed the house of Lords.

were "exquisitely searched for matter against him," while he was shamefully denied the use of them for the purposes of his defence¹. To establish that he was an enemy of Parliaments, and a subverter of the Laws, his own diary, and the proceedings of the Council, from the first moment that he became a member of it, had been painfully ransacked; and every dubious or arbitrary measure had been ascribed, exclusively, to his pernicious influence. To these was added a variety of smaller charges, some of which were contemptibly frivolous; others scandalously false; and which his accusers themselves must have well known to be so: and several of which they were compelled to abandon, as the trial went on. It is satisfactory to know, that the cruelties inflicted upon him, in his impeachment, his imprisonment, his trial, and his condemnation, are now pretty generally consigned to the infamy they deserve. They are condemned even by those, who revolt most fiercely against the principles, of which he is usually considered as the representative. They are viewed with abhorrence, by all who retain any unperverted sense of justice and humanity. With regard to the general merits of the Long Parliament, there may, at this hour, be every imaginable shade and variety of opinion. But, surely, there can be but one judgment formed respecting this ignominious exhibition of its temper. We can scarcely figure to ourselves a spectacle more wretchedly humiliating, than the Grand Inquest of the British nation, sitting, day after day, and week after week, while the patient and unwearied malice of little minds was collecting

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 413.

its paltry ammunition, and stoning its victim to death, as it were with pebbles!

The trial, which commenced on the 12th of March, continued, with some intervals of cessation, until the end of July. The Archbishop vindicated himself against every charge with such consummate ability, such intrepid bearing, and such evident consciousness of innocence and high desert, as won for him the admiration of all¹; and extorted expressions of splanetic wonder, and bitter praise, even from William Prynne himself. "To give him his due"—says that worthy—"he made as full, as gallant, and as pithy a defence of so bad a cause, and spake so much for himself, as it was possible for the wit of man to invent, and that, with so much art, sophistry, vivacity, oratory, audacity, and confidence, without the least blush or acknowledgment of guilt in any thing,—as argued him rather obstinate than innocent, impudent than penitent, a far better orator and sophister, than Protestant or Christian; yea, a truer son of the Church of Rome, than of the Church of England²." We may fully rely on the truth of the reluctant commendation here pronounced. The value of the censure will be duly estimated, when we remember that it came from one, who proclaimed Archbishop Laud to be the most execrable traitor and apostate that our English soil, or the whole Christian world, had ever bred³! Once, and only once, in the course of this persecution, did the spirit of Laud break forth into open and vehement indignation. One of the managers, a foul-mouthed ruffian, by the name of

¹ Troubles, p. 441.

² Cant. Doom, p. 462.

³ Ib. p. 565.

Nicolas, among other disgusting abuse, repeatedly reviled him, as a *pander to the whore of Babylon*. "I was much moved," says Laud, "and humbly desired the Lords, that, if my crimes were such, that I might not be used like an Archbishop, yet, I might be used like a Christian: and that, were it not for the duty I owed to God and my own innocence, I would desert my defence, before I would endure such language, in such an honourable presence." Their Lordships were sufficiently touched by this appeal, to desire that the speaker would lay aside his slanderous rhetoric, and proceed with the evidence¹.

The trial being finished, all appeared ripe for a sentence. But still there was more impediment than was anticipated. To use his own expression, "he had been sifted to the bran." Nevertheless, after all this sifting, whatever else was discovered, no *residuum* of treason could be found. On the 2nd of September, he was allowed to deliver a recapitulation of his impeachment and defence, before the Lords. The instant he came to the Bar, he perceived that every Peer in the House was provided with a thin folio, in a blue cover. This turned out to be the handywork of William Prynne; who had printed an infamously garbled *Breviate* of his Diary, embellished with his own commentaries, and had placed it in the hands of his Judges; in order that the sight of that secret record might strike a damp upon his spirit, and chain up his tongue. His wickedness, however, was, herein, signally defeated. The Archbishop "gathered up himself, and looked to God," and pronounced his recapitulation. His ad-

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 375.

dress produced such aggravated confusion among his enemies, that, two days afterwards, the Commons began to talk of having him sentenced by an *ordinance*. An impeachment of high treason, they found, would hardly reach him. But an attainder, by the "bare-faced power" of the two Houses, would be irresistible ¹.

After some further proceedings, and much clamour on the part of Nicolas, (who loudly demanded that the Archbishop should be hanged,) on the 11th of October, his Counsel were heard at the Bar of the Lords, on two points: *first*, whether his imputed offences amounted to treason; *secondly*, whether there were sufficient legal certainty and particularity in the articles of impeachment ². With regard to the former of these points, the Archbishop had already appealed, unanswerably, to the Lords, in his recapitulation. "If no particular," he said, "which is charged upon me, be treason, the result from them cannot. For the result must be of the same nature and species, as the particulars from which it rises: and this holds in nature, in morality, and in law. So, this imaginary result is a monster in nature, in morality, and in law: and if it be nourished, will devour all the safety of the subject, in England, which now stands so well fenced by the known law of the land." Yet was it now contended, with shameless effrontery, by Sergeant Wilde, in answer to the Archbishop's Counsel, that, although no single crime of his amounted to treason, or to felony,

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 411—421. Heylyn, p. 524.

² The argument is said to have been supplied by the illustrious Matthew Hale, then a young lawyer. Troubles, &c. p. 432, note.

yet did all his misdemeanors, when put together, form many grand treasons, by way of accumulation¹. But "nature, morality, and law," were, by this time, set at nought by them that were assembled to administer *justice*. The appeal was now to a very different authority. The passions of a delirious populace were called in, to quicken the tardy proceedings of the Judges. Towards the end of October, petitions were got up by the most disgraceful and inhuman artifices, for the speedy punishment of all *delinquents*. And, on the 1st of November, the Archbishop was summoned to appear at the bar of the House of Commons; who, in utter contempt of law or right, were pleased to treat their prisoner as if he were, already, degraded from the dignity of a Lord of Parliament. Well knowing that resistance would be useless, he obeyed the order. He was, then, apprised by the Speaker, that the ordinance for his attainder was actually drawn up, but was suspended till he should hear, and answer, a summary of the charge. On the 11th of November he pronounced his last defence. He began by acknowledging the comparatively moderate and civil manner in which the proceedings against him, had been recapitulated by Mr. Browne, the Clerk of the House. "For this," he said, "I render him my humble thanks; having, from other hands, pledged my Saviour in gall and vinegar, and drunk the cup of the scornings of the people, to the very bottom. I shall follow every thing in the same order he proceeded in; so far, forth, at least,

¹ To this combination of iniquity and nonsense, Hearne replied, "I cry your mercy, Mr. Serjeant: I never understood, before this time, that two hundred couple of black rabbits would make one black horse." State Trials, *ubi sup.*

as an old slow hand could take them, a heavy heart observe them, and an old decayed memory retain them." Having accomplished this, he reminded the House that they had before them, not the evidence itself, but merely a report of it, furnished by the individual who attended the House of Lords for that purpose : and, further, that this person was not always present ; and was, consequently, able to supply them, as to some particulars, only with a statement of what had been reported to him by others. And he conjured them to pause before they delivered a verdict upon such grounds as these. He next desired them to consider his calling, his age, his former life, his long and rigorous imprisonment. And, lastly, he made a solemn protestation, that, whatever might have been his infirmities or errors, " he never intended, much less endeavoured, the subversion of the laws of the kingdom, nor the bringing in of Popish superstition upon the true Protestant religion, established by law in this kingdom." These words, however, might as well have been addressed to the bare walls, as to the men who sat within them. The mystery of iniquity was now drawing towards its consummation. On the 16th, the ordinance for his attainder was passed, and instantly transmitted to the House of Lords : and, there, it found an impatient and most flagitious advocate, in the Chancellor of Oxford, the Earl of Pembroke. He disgraced himself, and his order, by the coarsest scurrility. He denounced the Archbishop as a rascal and a villain. And he had even the insolence and the turpitude to warn the Lords against the rashness of delaying their consent, till the rabble should be collected at their doors, to force it from them. He demanded of the

Lords what they stuck at? and asked them whether they imagined that the Commons had no conscience when they framed and passed the ordinance? So outrageous was his demeanor, that it was remarked, that, if ever there should be a parliament in Bedlam, his Lordship ought by all means to be chosen Speaker of it. In spite of this, the business lingered till the 17th of December. It was then voted that the Archbishop was, *in fact*, guilty of three things; *first*, of endeavouring to subvert the laws: *secondly*, of an attempt to overthrow the Protestant religion: and, *thirdly*, of being an enemy to Parliaments. The question was then put to the Judges, whether, or not, all this amounted to treason. Their unanimous answer was, that nothing with which he was charged by the impeachment, even if fully proved, would amount to treason, by any known and established law of the land.

The Lords had sufficiently degraded themselves by consenting to the attainder of Strafford. Nevertheless, the above response of the sages of the law arrested them, only for a moment, in their descent to still lower depths of infamy. At a conference, held on the 24th of December, they ventured to represent to their masters, the Commons, that, after the most diligent search, they were able to find no treason in the acts of which the Archbishop was accused. Another conference, however, took place on the 2nd
1645. of January, 1645, by which their consciences were so effectually enlightened, that, on the 4th of the same month, the ordinance of attainder was passed, by the voice of six Peers: the rest of that Assembly having absented themselves, through fear or shame. On the 7th, a third conference was solemnized; at

which the Lords informed the Commons, that the Archbishop had pleaded a pardon from the King, in arrest of judgment. This pardon had been granted by his Majesty at the suggestion of Hyde, then Chancellor of the Exchequer; and had been secretly conveyed to Laud, before he was brought to trial. It was received by him with great joy, as a testimony of his Sovereign's affection and esteem. But, he never imagined, for a moment, that it would protect him against the fury of men, who were levying war against the king himself. In fact, he might almost as well have pleaded a pardon from the Pope! The royal act of grace was, of course, pronounced to be of none effect against a judgment of the *Parliament*. The only favour vouchsafed to the prisoner, was, that the gibbet should be exchanged for the axe: and even this boon was extorted with extreme difficulty. His first application for it was brutally rejected. A second petition to the Lords was more successful. It was felt, at last, that an Archbishop of Canterbury, a Privy Counsellor, and a member of their own House, could not be hanged up like a common felon, without indelible disgrace to all concerned in his destruction. And the Commons, after some debate, reluctantly consented to the commutation¹.

The victory obtained by the *Liberators* of England, over all that is usually held sacred among Englishmen, was now complete. The Great Charter had said, that no man should be imprisoned without being brought to answer in due form of law,—that no man should be disseized of his freehold, but by the known laws of the land,—that no man should be put

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 422—443. Clar. vol. v. p. 33, 34. Rushw. vol. ii. p. 834.

to death, but by the legal judgment of his Peers. But these bulwarks fell flat, at the blast which was blown by the breath of the destructive faction. The Archbishop had been three years imprisoned, without being brought to answer ; he had been rifled of his property, and stripped of his patronage and jurisdiction ; and, lastly, he had been condemned to death : and all, by the votes of two assemblies, who were utterly destitute of legal power, over freedom, or property, or life, without the consent of the Crown. The parties to those votes must, therefore, be written criminals and murderers, to the end of time. It had been provided in the act of attainder against Strafford, that the measure should not be drawn into a precedent. And, it must be allowed, that the precedent was, now so much improved upon, that the condemnation of Laud appeared as a perfectly new and original atrocity. The assent of the king had been extorted, to the sacrifice of the statesman. But when the Archbishop was to be removed, the parliament was in open rebellion ; and no act of rebellion could well be more barefaced, than the *ordinance* by which the Archbishop was destroyed. By this one blow, the constitution of England was demolished.

But it would be puerile to dwell any longer upon crimes, on which any schoolboy might declaim, without much risk of exaggeration. We must hasten to the close of the tragedy. The intelligence of his doom was received by Laud, in the temper which became a Christian Bishop. It had long been manifest that he was neither ashamed to live, nor afraid to die. And, when death was once before him, he instantly broke off the history of his sufferings, and calmly prepared himself for his departure. On the evening

of January the 9th, the day before his execution, he refreshed himself with a moderate meal, retired to rest, and slept so soundly, that his attendants had to wake him when the hour was come. He then continued in prayer, until the officers arrived to conduct him to the scaffold. He had requested that three of his own chaplains might be with him in the Tower, and at the place of execution. But even this comfort was inhumanly denied him. One chaplain, indeed, his persecutors allowed to attend him, at his death: but, with him, they sent two of their own incendiaries and fanatics. On his way, he was occasionally assailed by the revilings of the lowest of the populace, who were unwilling that he should pass even to the grave in peace. But his composure was unruffled by these insults; and when he reached the spot, he ascended the platform "with so brave a courage, and a countenance so cheerful, as if he mounted rather to behold a triumph, than to be made a sacrifice." It was remarked, that four years of imprisonment and affliction had left the natural floridness of his complexion wholly unimpaired. Being permitted to speak to the people, he read to them a paper of considerable length, which he had drawn up for that purpose. In this address he acknowledged that, although he felt the infirmities of flesh and blood, and might have been glad that the cup which was given him should pass from him, yet he was now ready to drink it. He then reminded his hearers, that, when God's servants were driven to enter the Red Sea, their enemies were drowned in the pursuit. He was well assured, that God was able, if it seemed good to Him, to deliver him, even as He delivered the three faithful ones from the fiery furnace. His

resolution, too, was like theirs. He never would bow down before the image which the *people* had set up. Neither would he forsake the truth of God, as it were to follow the bleating of Jeroboam's calves. The people, he affirmed, were wretchedly misguided. He prayed that God, in his mercy, would open their eyes: for, now, the blind were leading the blind; and, if this should long continue to be so, both must fall into the ditch together. He knew that certain of his predecessors had been brought to a bloody grave. But he was now called upon to follow them by a path, before untrodden. He was not only the first Archbishop, but the first man, in England, who had died by an *ordinance* of Parliament. He trusted, however, that his cause would appear, in heaven, with a complexion very different from that which had been given to it on earth. He next observed, that our multiplied divisions had produced such a harvest to the Pope, as had never been known in England, since the Reformation. And he was deeply anxious to vindicate his majesty from any share in fostering that pernicious growth. On my conscience,—he said,—I know him to be as guiltless of this charge, as any man now living. I hold that he is as sound a Protestant, according to the religion by law established, as any man in his dominions; and that no one would more freely venture his life in defence of it. Having, next, warned the people how fearful a thing it was to fall into the hands of the Living God, when He maketh inquisition for blood, he lamented the condition of the Church of England, which had become like an oak cleft into shivers with wedges made out of its own body; and, at every cleft, profaneness and irreligion rushing in. He then pro-

ceeded to speak of himself: "I was born and baptized"—he says—"in the Church of England: in that profession I have ever since lived; and, in that, I come now to die. This is no time to dissemble with God; least of all in matters of religion. What clamours and slanders I have endured, for labouring to keep an uniformity in the external service of God, according to the doctrine and discipline of that Church, all men know, and I have abundantly felt. And now," he added, "I am accused of high treason; a crime which my soul abhors. I am charged with an endeavour to subvert the laws, and to overthrow the Protestant Religion. In vain I protested my innocence of these crimes. The protestations of prisoners, it was said, could never be received at the bar of justice. I can bring no witness of my heart! I now, therefore, make my protest, in the presence of God, and his holy angels, that I never did attempt the subversion either of religion or of law. I, further, have been maligned, as an enemy to Parliaments. I know their uses too well to be their enemy. But I, likewise, know that parliaments have been sometimes guilty of misgovernment and abuse; and that no corruption is so bad, as the corruption of that which, in itself, is excellent. From the power of parliaments, there is no appeal. If, therefore, they should be guilty of oppression, the subject is left without all remedy. But I have done;" he said, in conclusion, "I forgive all the world; all and every of those bitter enemies which have persecuted me. And I humbly desire to be forgiven—of God first; and then, of every man, whether I have offended him or not; if he do but conceive that I have, Lord do thou forgive me, and I do beg forgiveness of

him. And so, I heartily bid you join in prayer with me." He then fell on his knees, and uttered the following memorable supplication, no word of which should be suffered to perish from the annals of martyrdom :

"O eternal God and merciful Father ! look down upon me in mercy, in the riches and fulness of all thy mercies, look down upon me : but not till Thou hast nailed my sins to the cross of Christ, not till Thou hast bathed me in the blood of Christ ; not till I have hid myself in the wounds of Christ, that so the punishment due unto my sins may pass over me. And since Thou art pleased to try me to the utmost, I humbly beseech Thee, give me now in this great instant, full patience, proportionable comfort, and a heart ready to die for thine honour, the King's happiness, and the Church's preservation. And my zeal to this, (far from arrogancy be it spoken !) is all the sin, (human frailty excepted, and all the incidents thereunto,) which is yet known to me in this particular, for which I now come to suffer : I say, in this particular of treason. But otherwise my sins are many and great : Lord, pardon them all ; and those especially (whatever they are) which have drawn down this present judgment upon me ! And when Thou hast given me strength to bear it, do with me as seems best in thine own eyes ; and carry me through death, that I may look upon it, in what visage soever it shall appear to me. Amen ! And that there may be a stop of this issue of blood in this more than miserable kingdom, (I shall desire that I may pray for the people too, as well as for myself ;) O Lord, I beseech Thee, give grace of repentance to all blood-thirsty people. But if they will not repent, O Lord, con-

found all their devices, defeat and frustrate all their designs and endeavours, upon them, which are or shall be contrary to the glory of thy great name, the truth and sincerity of Religion, the establishment of the King and his posterity after him in their just rights and privileges, the honour and conservation of Parliaments in their just power, the preservation of this poor Church in her truth, peace, and patrimony, and the settlement of this distracted and distressed people under their ancient laws, and in their native liberty. And when Thou hast done all this in mere mercy to them, O Lord, fill their hearts with thankfulness, and with religious, dutiful obedience to Thee and thy commandments all their days. Amen, Lord Jesus, Amen. And receive my soul into thy bosom! Amen. Our Father which art in heaven, &c.”

When he had concluded this prayer, he delivered the paper to his Chaplain, Sterne, who had been permitted to attend him; and begged of him to communicate it to his brother Chaplains, all of whom he commended to the mercies of God. And, having observed that a person by the name of Hind had been employed in taking down his speech, he besought of the man not to misreport him to the world: but faithfully and carefully to represent his dying words and prayers. He then advanced towards the block: but, finding the platform crowded with spectators, he entreated that he might have room to die peaceably, and so to escape the miseries he had endured so long—observing, that he was as willing to leave the world as his enemies could be to send him from it. On perceiving, through the crevices of the scaffold, that some persons were collected beneath, immediately below the block, he re-

requested that they might be removed, or that dust might be spread over the spot: as it was no part of his desire that his blood should fall upon the heads of the people. "All this he did with so serene and calm a mind, as if he had been taking order for some nobleman's funeral, than preparing for his own." One man there was, among the assembled multitude, who seemed unwilling that his last moments should be left without disturbance. This was Sir John Clotworthy (a native of Ireland, and member for some borough in Devonshire,) who had already distinguished himself by his outrageous violence against the Earl of Strafford, and who, afterwards, (in 1648,) was imprisoned, by order of the House, with several others of the Presbyterian party¹. The coarse fanatic began to harass the dying Prelate with impertinent and insidious questions. He asked, what was the most comfortable saying for a man at the point of death? The Archbishop meekly replied, "I desire to be dissolved, and to be with Christ:" (*cupio dissolvi, et esse cum Christo.*) But then, "what was the fittest speech with which the departing Christian could manifest his assurance?" The reply was, that such assurance was to be found within, and that no words could fitly express it. "The assurance, however," Clotworthy still insisted, "was founded upon a word; and that word should be known." "It is founded on the knowledge of Jesus Christ," said Laud, "and on that alone." How much longer this insolent catechizing might have lasted, it is impossible to say. But Laud naturally grew weary of it, and turned away from his inquisi-

¹ Clarendon, vol. i. 300, 301; vol. vi. 208. Oxf. ed.

tor, to the executioner, as the gentler and discreeter person of the two. Having put some money into the man's hand, he said to him, with unruffled countenance, "Honest friend, God forgive thee, as I do. Do thine office upon me with mercy." He then sunk, again, upon his knees, and prayed shortly in these words: "I am coming, O Lord, as quickly as I can. I know I must pass through death, before I can come to see thee. But, it is only the mere shadow of death; a little darkness upon nature. Thou, by thy merits, hast broken through the jaws of death. The Lord receive my soul, and have mercy upon me; and bless this kingdom with peace and plenty, and with brotherly love and charity, that there may not be this effusion of Christian blood among them; for Jesus Christ's sake, if it be thy will." Having laid his head upon the block, after a few moments of silent supplication, he said aloud, *Lord receive my soul*. This was the death-signal agreed upon. The axe fell: and a single blow of it delivered the Archbishop, for ever, from his persecutors. The instant the head was severed from the body, the countenance turned to an ashy paleness: and thus gave the lie to the execrable calumny that he had painted his face, in order that he might die at least with the complexion of fortitude. But, even so, the malice of his revilers was not left without one miserable resource: for, some there were who scrupled not to affirm that his courage was but artificial, and that he had braced up his nerves for the last agony, by the help of some cordial preparation!

"Thus fell Laud," says Heylyn, "and the Church fell with him: the Liturgy whereof was voted down, about the same time that the ordinance was passed

for his condemnation ; the Presbyterian Directory authorized for the press, by ordinance, March 13th, next following ; episcopacy, root and branch, (which had before been pre-condemned,) suppressed by ordinance, in like manner, October 9, 1646 ; the lands of all the Cathedrals sold, to the exposing of those stately fabrics to inevitable ruin ; the Bishops dispossessed of their lands and rents, without the charity of a small annual pension towards their support ; the regular and conformable clergy sequestered, ejected, and turned out of all, to the utter undoing of themselves, their wives, and children ; a wide gap opened for letting in of all sects and heresies, many of which had been exploded and condemned in primitive times, others so new (and every day begetting newer,) that few of them have served out their apprenticeship, and yet trade as freely, as if they had served out all their time ; the sacred Ministry, in the mean time, or that part of it, at least, which consists in preaching, usurped by handicrafts-men, boys, and women, to the dishonour of God, the infamy and disgrace of the English nation, and the reproach of our religion, so much renowned (as long as he continued in power) both for external glory, and internal purity. And yet, it cannot be denied, that he fell very opportunely, in regard of himself, before he saw those horrible confusions, which have since broken into the Church ; the dissipation of the Clergy, the most calamitous death of his gracious sovereign, and the extermination threatened to the royal family. The opportunity of a quiet and untroubled death, was reckoned for a great felicity, in the noble Agricola ; who could not, save in the course of a long life, have felt the hundredth

part of those griefs and sorrows, which would have pierced the soul of this pious Prelate, had not God gathered him to his fathers, in so good an hour¹."

The body of the Archbishop was interred in the Church of All-hallows, Barking, near the Tower. By this time, the ordinance for the suppression of the Liturgy had been passed. The funeral, nevertheless, was solemnized according to the proscribed formulary; so that it seemed as if the Establishment, for which he died, had been buried with him². It had been his wish that his dust might repose within the walls of his own college: and this desire was, eventually, accomplished. For, after the restoration, in July, 1633, his remains were transferred to the chapel at St. John's; and were there deposited, beneath the altar, close by the bones of Sir Thomas Whyte, the munificent founder of the Institution. At the same time, his memory was honoured with a funeral oration, pronounced by the Vice-President, in the presence of the Vice-Chancellor, several of the heads of Houses, and a full assembly of the members of the College. The remains of his own familiar friend, Archbishop Juxon, and of Richard Bayley, the President of the College, who had married his niece, were, subsequently, consigned to the same spot. So that the Archbishop rests in the immediate neighbourhood of men, in company with whom, of all others, he would probably have desired to meet his God, in the great day of judgment.

By his last will, he declared that he died a true and faithful member of the Protestant Church of

¹ Heylyn, p. 539.

² Book of the Church, vol. ii. p. 453.

England. His chief bequests are as follows: First, the sum of £800 towards the repair of St. Paul's, if that work should be continued. This sum, however, it would appear, had been already consigned to the custody of some trustee, with a view to its application to the purpose in question: for, he adds, "my executors are not charged with this. It is safe, in other hands." Secondly, he leaves £1,000 to the King, besides remitting to his Majesty a debt of £2,000. Thirdly, he bequeaths to St. John's College, his chapel plate, furniture, and books; together with £500, to be invested in the purchase of land; the rent of which was to be distributed, every fourth year, among the Fellows and scholars. "Something else," he says, with modest reference to his own princely benefactions, "I have done for them already, according to my ability. And God's everlasting blessing be upon that place, and that society, for ever." Then follow various smaller legacies, to friends, servants, and others, amounting in all to about £1,800. Among these bequests, is the sum of £100, for the purpose of translating his book against Fisher into Latin, "that the Christian world might see, and judge of his religion." If these dispositions were carried into effect, it may be concluded, that, although his persecutors kept him from the use of his property, during his imprisonment, they did not aggravate their infamy, by confiscating the remnants of it, after his death. His concluding words are, "Thus I forgive all the world; and heartily desire forgiveness of God, and the world. And so, again, I commend and commit my soul into the hands of God the Father, who gave it; in the merits and mercies of my blessed Saviour, Jesus Christ, who redeemed it; and in the

peace and comfort of the Holy Ghost, who blessed it ; and in the truth and unity of his Holy Catholic Church ; and in the communion of the Church of England, as it yet stands established by law ¹." From which solemn asseveration it follows, either that the heart of Archbishop Laud was faithful to the religion which he was accused of undermining ; or else, that he was prepared to appear in the presence of God *with a lie in his right hand!*

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 454. Harl. MSS. 4115.

CHAPTER IX.

General view of the character and principles of Laud.

It has been remarked of Laud, that more good and more evil has been said and written of him, than of almost any other historical character that can be named. By some he has been extolled as a miracle of piety and beneficence, of learning and of wisdom. By others, he has been stigmatized as an exemplification of every thing that is inhuman in tyranny, despicable in bigotry and superstition, diabolical in temper, and narrow in understanding. By his admirers, he has been held up as the mirror of loyalty to his King, of fidelity to the Constitution, as it then existed, and of enlightened zeal for the Church over which he presided. By his adversaries, he has been described as an abject worshipper of the royal prerogative, and as a malignant conspirator against the liberties and the religion of his country. And, by some of those who profess to avoid each of these extremities, it has been averred, that, notwithstanding his unbounded devotion to the Church, he was, in effect, one of her most pernicious enemies; and that his baleful administration, if it did not occasion, at least accelerated, her downfall.

This latter accusation, if we recollect right, has been adopted by Warburton, if it did not originate with him. It is very much in his sweeping and trenchant manner; and like many other of his posi-

tions, must be adopted with some caution, and understood with considerable limitation. That the administration of Laud was, in some respects, injurious to the Church, can hardly be denied. But then, it is most important to keep in mind, that the injury was inflicted, not so much by the measures which he adopted, as by the manner in which he enforced them. There has seldom, perhaps, lived a man, who contrived that his good should be so virulently evil spoken of. From all that we learn of him, his manner appears to have been singularly ungracious and unpopular, and his temper offensively irascible and hot. If we are to trust the representations of him, left us either by friend or foe, he must have been one of the most disagreeable persons in the three kingdoms, except to those who were intimately acquainted with his worth. There was nothing affable or engaging in his general behaviour. His very integrity was often made odious, by wearing an aspect of austerity and haughtiness. It would almost seem, as if prudence had been struck out of his catalogue of the cardinal virtues. In him, "discretion seldom fought against nature." He never appears to have been aware, that the world is governed or rendered ungovernable, by syllables, and looks, and gestures, and tones of voice; that manner is something with every person, and every thing with some. He was unable, as Warburton remarks, to comprehend one important truth, with which Richelieu was so familiar, when he said, that, if he had not spent as much time in civilities, as in business, he had undone his master¹. The conse-

¹ Warburton's note to Clarendon, vol. i. p. 165. in vol. vii. p. 521. Oxf. ed. 1826.

quence of this ignorance, or this disdain, of the ways of the world, was unspeakably hurtful to the cause which, at all times, was nearest to his heart. In the minds of many who were ignorant of the essential excellence of the man, the interests of the Establishment were, by his demeanour, associated with almost every thing that is harsh and repulsive. For a considerable portion of his life, he was regarded not only as the leader, but the representative, of the ecclesiastical body : and the impression which he communicated to the public was, too often, that of unfeeling arrogance, and lofty impatience of control. Whether the Church could have been saved by any combination, in the person of its ruler, of those rare endowments which secure at once both reverence and attachment, no human sagacity can, at this day, be competent to pronounce. But it certainly is not altogether surprising that this one unhappy defect should, even in the minds of judicious and impartial men, have connected his administration with the ruin of the Establishment. In such unquiet times, more especially, a man like Laud would not only be dreaded as a firm and conscientious disciplinarian, but as the rigorous and overbearing priest. And the Church would be sure to suffer most grievously for the unpopularity of her governor. All this may safely and reasonably be conceded. But it must, likewise, be allowed, that nothing could well be more disgraceful to his adversaries than their incurable and wilful blindness to his virtues. His best friends were sensible of his faults. His enemies had no eye to see his manifold redeeming excellences !

Among his friends, there was no man of that age who entertained a deeper sentiment, than Clarendon,

of reverence and affection towards Archbishop Laud. And yet, there was no man more painfully sensible of the lamentable consequences of his infirmity of temper. This appears very forcibly, in those passages of his History which relate to the Archbishop. But it appears still more forcibly, from a very free expostulation with him, upon which the historian ventured, when he was only a young practitioner of the law. In his History of his own Life, Clarendon has given a very full and interesting account of a conference between himself and Laud, in the year 1635 : from which it appears, that the youthful barrister went pretty roundly to work with his Grace ; and, it should be added, that his Grace was by no means displeased, or alienated, by the freedom of his monitor. It was the belief of Edward Hyde, that the Primate needed nothing so much, as a true friend, who would seasonably tell him of his weaknesses. And he, accordingly, mustered boldness to take this office upon himself. He found the Archbishop, one morning, early, in that part of his garden which, to this day, is known as Clarendon's walk. He was graciously received ; and asked, what good news there was in the country. The answer of Hyde was, that there was no good news ; that the people were universally discontented ; and spoke of his Grace as the cause of all that was amiss. Laud replied, that he was sorry to hear this : but added, that he knew that he had done nothing to deserve the censure ; and that he must not desist from serving the King and the Church, in order to please the people. Hyde then told him, that there could be no necessity for an abatement of his zeal, either for King or Church : but that it grieved him to find that

many persons, of the best condition, who were well affected to both, were, nevertheless, extremely ill-disposed towards his Grace, and complained of the treatment they experienced from him, whenever they had occasion to resort to him. He then mentioned several instances, in illustration and support of this unwelcome remark. The Archbishop listened patiently to the recital: and his reply was abundantly mild and candid. But it showed that the defect was, then, inveterate and incurable. He said that he was very unfortunate to be so misunderstood; that, by nature, the tone of his voice was sharp, and might cause men to believe that he was angry, when it was no such thing; that with his pressing variety of occupations, he had no time to spare for compliments (for which, however, Richelieu contrived to find abundant leisure); that his integrity and uprightness would be found beyond reproach; and that, if these could not preserve him, he must even submit to God's pleasure. In spite of all this, Hyde still pressed him close; and wished that he would more restrain his passion towards all men, however faulty they might be; and, particularly, that he would treat persons of honour, and quality, and interest in the country, with more courtesy and condescension; especially when they came to visit him, and to make offer of their service. All, however, would not do! Laud was, then, sixty-two years of age; and, at that period of life, any essential alteration of his manners, was a hopeless matter. He replied, smiling, that he could only answer for his heart; that his meaning was good; that, for his tongue, he could not undertake that he might not, sometimes, speak more hastily and sharply than he ought, (which, often-

times, he was sorry for,) and that, consequently, he might be liable to misconstruction with those who knew not that such was his infirmity; and that it was so rooted in him by nature and education, that it was altogether vain to contend with it. He then adverted to the imputation of maintaining too stately a distance towards those who resorted to him; and intimated that, really, it was no more than was suitable to his rank in the Church and in the State. He then adverted to the behaviour of that grave religionist, his predecessor, Archbishop Abbot, towards the greatest nobility of the realm: which, however, he did allow to have been, frequently, most insolent and inexcusable; and which, as Hyde observes, was, beyond all question, exceedingly ridiculous ¹.

Nothing could well be more base, than the advantage often taken by the courtiers, of this infirmity in the Archbishop's temper. It was their delight to contradict him, for the express purpose of betraying him into some excess of passion, which might render him at once odious and contemptible. A remarkable instance of this, which occurred about the year 1635, is related by Clarendon, in his History. The King, who, like his father, was passionately addicted to the sports of the field, was desirous of enclosing a park, between Richmond and Hampton Court. This, however, could not be done, without the invasion of many existing interests. The King was willing to purchase, upon liberal terms. Most of the parties consented: but others held out obstinately. His Majesty, nevertheless, was resolved to persevere; and had actually commenced the wall which was to

¹ Life of Clarendon, vol. i. p. 69—74. Oxf. ed.

enclose his hunting ground. Laud began to be alarmed. He conceived that the King was about to purchase his princely recreation at the price of a ruinous sacrifice of popularity. He accordingly conferred with Lord Cottington, and urged him to withdraw his Majesty from a resolution so injurious to his honour. To his utter astonishment, Cottington gravely answered, that, in his judgment, the design was both reasonable and lawful. To this, the Archbishop replied, with great warmth, that such men as he would ruin the King; and that he (Laud), for his part, would spare no pains to dissuade his Majesty. The other rejoined, with unruffled calmness, that such an attempt could proceed from nothing but want of affection to the King's person. Nay, he was not sure that it might not be high treason. For they, who sought to deprive his Majesty of the recreation needful for his health, might possibly be thought guilty of the highest crimes! On this, the rage of the Archbishop became ungovernable. He loaded Cottington with reproaches, and then left him. It very soon appeared, that Cottington's sole object, throughout this conversation, had been to provoke the Archbishop to some ridiculous and degrading eruption of anger. For when he represented the matter to the King, his Majesty replied, "Cottington is too hard for you! He has, actually, incurred my displeasure, by his own pertinacious opposition to this very same project. You see how unjustly your passion has transported you¹."

It should be mentioned, however, to the honour of Laud, that, notwithstanding the imputed stern-

¹ Clarendon, vol. i. p. 176—180. Oxford edition.

ness of his temper and deportment, he does not seem to have been capable of resenting the freedom of zealous and affectionate remonstrance. Of this we have one remarkable proof, in the fact, that Hyde, although so much his junior in age, and his inferior in station, was always received by him with more gracious familiarity than ever, after the interview of frank expostulation, above related. And hence he concludes, that, if his Grace had been blessed with some intelligent and true-hearted friend, who would have dealt openly with him, on the most important and critical occasions, he would gladly have accepted such good offices, and would have derived from them much unspeakable advantage¹. As it was, however, it appears, from nearly the whole tenor of his life, that, what with a hasty temperament, and what with an imperfect knowledge of mankind, and what with an erroneous notion of the demeanour which became his exalted rank, he contrived to array more hostility against his virtues, than many of the worst of mankind have, often, armed against their vices. And thus he may be said to have furnished some ground for the charge of Warburton, by exasperating the bad passions which, already, were let loose for the destruction of the hierarchy.

There is, indeed, one occurrence in his life, which, though in itself comparatively trifling, places him in a more unamiable light, than almost any other which has been recorded. It happened, on the 11th of March, 1637, that Archibald Armstrong, the King's Fool, met his Grace as he was going to the council-

¹ Life of Clar. ubi supra.

table, and said to him, "Who is the *fool* now¹? Has not your Grace heard the news from Scotland, about the Liturgy?" with some other words which are not known, but which, probably, were disrespectful enough. This, we are told, was presently complained of to the Council; who, on that very day, condemned the poor knave to lose his motley, and to be sent away from the Court! Such was the melancholy fate of the last of the English Court-Fools²! It is possible, indeed, that the jester may have been found more troublesome and mischievous than has been related: or, perhaps, he may have chanced to cross the Archbishop, at a moment, when he and the whole Court were sorely chafed with the vexatious affairs of Scotland. But, at all events, a few words of stern rebuke from the Lord Chamberlain, might, surely, have been sufficient for the correction of the licensed dealer in humour and buffoonery!

But the meanest exhibition which has ever been given of Laud, in former days, is, in some respects, almost complimentary, when compared with the portraiture with which we have been made familiar, in more modern times. They who, in his own age, most potently believed him to be a knave, never, for a moment, imagined him to be an idiot. But, according to more recent representations, he was, almost without exception, the most contemptible character in English History: and the Parliament

¹ Or, in Archy's own pure Doric, "Wha's the fule now?" See Rushworth, *ad ann.* 1637, p. 470, 471.

² A professional buffoon was not wanted at the court of Charles II. His Majesty was surrounded with men, some of whom were always ready to discharge the office, as *amateurs*.

was to blame for their treatment of him, not because it was meanly vindictive, and detestably iniquitous, but, because so much good and serviceable persecution was thrown away upon so insignificant an object. It is distinctly allowed, indeed, that he was no traitor within the statute; but this was, purely, because his capacities were too limited to advance him to the dignity of treason: so that it was beneath the majesty of a great nation to inflict upon him any thing but contemptuous mercy. Worthless as he was, the impeachment or the attainder, the gibbet or the axe, would be positively degraded by their employment upon so poor an adventurer in crime¹. In support of this last version of his character, his Diary has been referred to, as a performance which might make us forget the vices of his heart in the feebleness of his understanding. Now, undoubtedly, if Laud had left us nothing but this private journal, we should have been without any warrant for numbering him among our distinguished scholars and divines. But, even in that case, to estimate his powers by his occasional notice of dreams and omens, would, surely, be about as reasonable, as to measure the capacities of Samuel Johnson by the scraps and fragments which record his fits of melancholy or superstition; by his reminiscences of his wife; and by his prayers for the peace of her departed spirit. Again, to judge of Laud's sagacity, or wisdom, by the entries of matter of fact in his Diary, would be nearly as ridi-

¹ This, also, appears to be the opinion of Godwin, who says, that the spectacle of the Archbishop's age and infirmities "ought to have disarmed his enemies, and induced them to dismiss him to obscurity and *contempt*." Hist. Commonw. vol. i. p. 429.

culous, as it would be to look into the daily collection of accidents or occurrences, for a test of ability in the conductor of a public journal. The Diary of the Archbishop consists chiefly of dry memoranda of passing events, made, obviously, for his own private convenience. Occasionally, it is true, he notices a dream, or an accident, to which imagination might give an ominous complexion. And, although he disclaims all settled confidence in such shadowy suggestions, it does, at times, appear as if they left some vague impression upon his mind. But the mightiest understandings will, now and then, be crossed by gloomy associations, and dim forebodings; especially when harassed and excited by affairs of overpowering interest. Besides, some allowance must be made for opinions and prejudices still current in an age not yet wholly cleared of popular superstitions. It is quite notorious, that many of the Puritans and Covenanters were firm believers in sorcery and witchcraft; and that their hatred was seldom at a loss to discover signs and prognostics of the Archbishop's fall. It is, therefore, most unaccountable that any one should think of fixing upon certain passages of these secret memoranda, extending, as they do, over a space of more than fifty years, and of producing these as evidence of a mind enslaved and enfeebled by superstitious fancies.

But, though we cannot appeal to the Diary of Laud, in support of his literary or theological reputation, we may, assuredly, consult it for a much higher purpose. It has been said, that his letters to Strafford indicate no sense of duty to God or man; that his concern for the honour of the University, his anxiety to improve the condition of the Clergy, his

efforts to restore the decency and solemnity of public worship, and his solicitude to preserve the sacred edifices from ruin and profanation, all are to be ascribed to a feeling purely professional ; such as may be often found in the most abandoned of human beings, without implying either devotion to God, or good will towards men. Now, if all this, *for a moment*, were admitted, we still might appeal to the loose unpremeditated fragments of his journal ; and we might ask, whether it is possible for any man to witness the secret outpourings of the Prelate's heart, and yet to charge him with a want of charity or religion ? To what shall we ascribe his repeated expressions of trust in the merciful protection of Providence, and his frequent invocation of forgiveness on his enemies, persecutors, and slanderers ; breathed and recorded, as they were, in the solitude of his chamber ? Must we attribute them to a habit of professional hypocrisy, so inveterate, as to pursue the individual into his retirements from the world ? At the end of his Diary, is printed a list of noble and munificent projects, which the Archbishop had formed, and some of which he lived to accomplish. Are we to believe that these costly and charitable designs were suggested by no higher or better feeling than that of a bigotted devotion to his order ? Are we to presume, that the person who could make the following entry in his journal, was under no sense of duty to his Creator, or his brethren. " The way to do the town of Reading good, for their poor : which may be compassed, by God's blessing upon me, though my wealth be small. And I hope God will bless me in it, because it was his own motion in me. For this way never came into my thoughts

(though I had much beaten them about it) till this night, as I was at my prayers. Jan. 1st, 1633-4." Can this have been the language of one who was destitute of the elements which constitute an amiable and worthy man, and who, throughout his life, was a stranger to any better motive than the indulgence of malignant humour?

Very different from this, was the estimate formed, by many of his contemporaries, of the heart, and the principles, of Archbishop Laud. We learn from those, who had opportunities of knowing, that he won the blessings of the poor by weekly alms, and daily hospitality; and that, every where, he was tracked by his benefactions¹. In fact, he appears to have been emulous of that ancient piety, to which we owe the venerable edifices, and noble foundations, which form both the strength and the glory of this land. His vigilant and generous care for the interests of learning must, still further, entitle him to the grateful admiration of his country, so long as literature shall be cherished and honoured among men. His anxiety, on this subject, is attested by the vast and costly contributions to the literary treasures of Oxford. It is attested, perhaps still more gloriously, by the illustrious names which owed their advancement to his patronage and favour². They who are accustomed to search out the worst of all imaginable motives, for every action that may wear the semblance of virtue, may find delight in the belief, that the munificence of Laud, and his encouragement of distin-

¹ Lloyd's Memoirs, &c. p. 228—230.

² Usher, Hales, Chillingworth, Morton, Montague, Poccocke, Hall, Bramhall, Saunderson, Sheldon, Juxon, Jeremie Taylor, &c.

guished men, was, after all, nothing more than so much professional ostentation; an artifice for connecting his own name with the honours of genius and learning. But the heart which can please itself with seeing the image and superscription of evil, thus impressed on gracious and useful deeds, will hardly find much sympathy among the wise or good. In spite of all such detraction, Laud will, immoveably, maintain his station among the most eminent and single-hearted benefactors to letters and religion ¹.

And, here, how can we forbear to warn mankind against the voice of Judas, which, even now, is evermore crying out, *why all this waste?* Why should large revenues be placed at the command of men, whom it would better become to emulate the poverty of the Apostles, than to be revelling in affluence which might almost befit a prince? Is it nothing, then, that wealth should, here and there, be placed in the hands of those, whose very education and profession are constantly reminding them, that it is a part of their office to show the world how wealth may best be spent; and who, if ever they should forget that they are the stewards of the Lord, are sure to be pursued by the scorn and execration of the world? Let any man search into the result of this distribution. Let him look back through a long range of

¹ They who are desirous of forming any adequate conception of the services rendered to literature by Archbishop Laud, should, by all means, peruse a paper, on that subject, read by Archdeacon Todd, before the Royal Society of Literature, March 15th and April 5th, 1826. Transactions, &c. vol. ii. p. 205—226. From that statement it will appear, that the Archdeacon was guilty of no exaggeration, in saying, that the bounty of this prelate was more like that of a king than of a subject.

centuries; and see whether the cause of civilization, of letters, of morals, of charity, of religion, has, on the whole, been best promoted by the wealth of laymen, or by the wealth of ecclesiastics. If churchmen had always been indigent stipendiaries, where would have been numberless monuments of benevolence and piety, to which all, save the children of disobedience, look up, to this day, with affection, and gratitude, and reverence? And, (to return to the matter before us,) what would England have gained—what might she not have lost—if the revenues of Archbishop Laud had been consigned to the disposal of any nobleman of his time?

With regard to the intellectual powers of Laud, something has been already said: more especially in reference to his encounter with the Jesuit, and his answer to the Covenanting Scots. On the first of these occasions, he had to meet “the sharp fence and the active practice” of a subtle antagonist; and, in the other, to repel the onset of fierce and fanatical hostility. At this day, neither of these achievements is known so well as it deserves. In the first place, the interest originally attached to the matters in question has become well nigh obsolete. The Presbyterian discipline has long been established in the northern division of the kingdom, and is peaceably tolerated in every other. The controversy with Rome has slumbered for upwards of a century; though it is scarcely probable that the slumber will remain much longer undisturbed. If that conflict should ever be generally renewed, we shall, doubtless, be awakened to a due estimate of this, among many other implements, in the magazines of our National Theology. But, secondly, the style of Laud, though

vigorous and pithy, is, undoubtedly, defective in polish and refinement. There is something too homely, and colloquial, about it. It has little either of the terseness or of the dignity of written composition. It is, in general, scarcely more attractive than that of Bishop Butler. Laud seems to have written, for the most part, like Butler, in the manner of one who thinks aloud. But the importance of his subjects is not, like that of Butler's, of all countries and of all times. And hence, the neglect and oblivion into which his works have fallen. A revival of the public attention to his writings, though it might not elevate him to a place among the greatest masters of composition, would, assuredly, put to flight all doubts respecting the powers of his understanding, or the extent of his attainments¹.

Respecting the personal habits and private life of the Archbishop, our information is far from copious. We learn, however, that his diet was uniformly temperate, and his walk and conversation blameless. Such was his circumspection, that no female domestic was suffered in his establishment. That his demeanour towards his dependents was kind and

¹ No complete collection has ever been made of the writings and correspondence of Laud. We learn from the Clarendon Papers, vol. ii. p. 328, that his own College were, at one time, collecting materials for his Life. It is much to be regretted, that their design was never carried into execution; especially if it involved a collection of his works. In the MS. Closet of Cosin's Library, at Durham, there is a Volume, No. 5, without a regular title, consisting, chiefly, of extracts from the works of eminent men. Among the rest, is one collection, headed *Laudæana*: consisting of many of the most striking passages from his writings. Some few specimens from this collection will be found in the Appendix, at the end of this volume.

affable, may be reasonably inferred from the fact, already noticed, that his steward, Adam Torless, lived with him two and forty years, and died in his service, some time after his imprisonment. He was singularly plain in his apparel ; and could not easily endure in others, more especially in the clergy, any departure from the simplicity which he exemplified in his own person. Cardinal Wolsey is reported to have been the first Prelate who introduced, by his own example, a costly style of dress among the clergy. And Laud was the first who inflexibly set his face against that unseemly fashion. It has been related, that he once openly reprov'd a Clergyman, who appeared in a gallant habit, at a visitation held by him in Essex, when he was Bishop of London, and bade him compare his own finery with the plain habiliments of his Diocesan. The minister replied, " My Lord, you have better clothes at home, and I have worse." The sternness of the Prelate was disarmed by the readiness and vivacity of the answer : which seems to show that he was by no means inaccessible to the influences of good humour. His regard for his own connexions never degenerated into partiality or *nepotism*. He is said to have relieved his friends rather than raised them. " Breed up your children well," he would say to his relatives, " and I will do what I can, and ought, to provide for them." But no tie of kindred or alliance could induce him to promote any person, whom he deemed unworthy of his patronage. Fuller, the Church Historian, informs us, that he knew a near kinsman of Laud's, in the University, not deficient in scholarship, but withal, somewhat wild and lazy, who could obtain no assistance or encouragement from his Lordship, until his habits were thoroughly

reformed. Covetousness he perfectly abhorred. He scorned the accumulation of a private treasure, and the thought of abusing the revenues or the patronage of the Church, to the elevation of his name or family. And, being himself unmarried, his resources were the more at his disposal, for designs of public munificence. Of the sincerity and constancy of his religious exercises, it is almost needless to speak. The moral and devotional habit of his mind is sufficiently attested, both by his Diary and his private Prayers. "He can hardly be an ill husband," says Fuller, "who casteth up his receipts and expenses, every night: and such a soul is, or would be, good, which enters into a daily scrutiny of his own actions."

In the personal appearance of the Archbishop, there was nothing stately or commanding. His stature was low; and the whole frame of his body, rather diminutive. His eye, however, was bright and piercing; and his countenance expressive both of gravity and quickness. His complexion was of a fresh and sanguine cast, which he preserved to the end of his life, in spite of his anxieties and afflictions. In one particular he resembled the party to which he was constantly opposed: he wore his hair so close, that, to judge by that, he might almost have been taken for a Puritan, or a Roundhead. His memory, almost to the last, was firm and tenacious; his mind singularly active and inquisitive; and his temperament fervid and impetuous. He was not content to serve his generation by himself alone; but endeavoured to communicate his own public spirit to all who were ambitious of his esteem. It was acknowledged by some who were his enemies, that no man, whatever might be his station, was ever

admitted to his confidence, without approving himself fit for it, by some act or purpose, which, in his judgment, tended to the public good, or to the honour of religion. It was his habit to converse, often and freely, with individuals of the best intelligence, in various occupations or professions, whether Clergymen, or Lawyers, or even Mechanics. He was exact in his correspondence, quick in the dispatch of business, and keenly observant and curious in his intercourse with all. Like the illustrious Lord Burleigh, he kept by him a catalogue of the principal nobility and gentry in the realm, with a notice of their respective interests and inclinations. And it was observed by him, that "no man was more perfectly acquainted than he, with the joints, and flexures of every party in the state ¹." Whether he was gifted with the highest qualities of statesmanship, may, perhaps, be questioned: and it would have been well for his peace and reputation, if he had never been tempted to the trial.

There can be very little doubt, that Laud owed his ruin, in a considerable degree, to the scarcely defensible practice of investing spiritual persons with arduous secular responsibilities. Neither Lords nor Commons, nor populace, could endure to see the post of Prime Minister filled by an Ecclesiastic. The usage might be tolerable, and, at times, indispensable, in those darker periods, when learning and intelligence were nearly monopolized by the Clergy. But those days of ignorance had long been passing away. The Laity, no longer disqualified, by a defective education, for the highest departments of pub-

¹ Lloyd's State Worthies. See Warburton's Notes on Neale.

lic duty, regarded the intrusion of Churchmen into political office, with bitter jealousy and disgust. In Protestant countries, more especially, this confusion of worldly and sacred offices, was almost sure to be indignantly reprobated. It is much to be lamented that Laud failed to discern the spirit of the times ; or that, perceiving it, he refused to respect a feeling, which can hardly excite either wonder or condemnation. The care of his diocese, or his province, must, in the judgment of every enlightened Christian, be the most appropriate sphere of action for a Prelate. And most happy would it have been for Laud himself, if he had strictly conformed himself to these reasonable views ; and had limited his concern in matters of State to the discharge of his duty in the House of Peers, and, on certain occasions, at the Council table. But, even if he was insensible of this, it still would be most unjust to ascribe his blindness to the operation of a selfish appetite for power. No man seems to have felt more deeply than he, the weariness and painfulness of political life. But his mind was full of energy and ardour ; his courage was undaunted ; his zeal for the King's service exalted ; and his indignation at the shameful sacrifice of the royal interests, which his position at court was constantly exposing to his view, seems to have acted like a fire shut up within his bones. He could not have withdrawn himself from the counsels of his Sovereign, without feeling guilty of ungrateful and almost treasonable desertion.

In order to illustrate these remarks, it may here be fitly mentioned, that we find him, when he was a Commissioner of the Treasury, in 1635, writing thus to Strafford : " There is no speech, here, but who

shall be Lord Treasurer. And, I would that the King would name one, that our *troublesome commission* were at an end. And yet I cannot be so ill a servant to my master and the public, as to wish an end to this commission, *for mine own ease*, till the King resolve of a good one. For, certainly, such a one will he need: and perhaps more an honest than a cunning one¹." And when he retired from the Treasury, so utterly unconscious did he seem, that the office was unfit for a clergyman, that he laboured to procure Juxon for his successor; and expressed the highest satisfaction, on the accomplishment of his purpose². And, assuredly, never was the exchequer consigned to more able or more honest administration.

His own notions, relative to the lawfulness and the expediency of employing Churchmen in state affairs, are very copiously expounded, in his answer to the speech of Lord Say against the Bishops³. His vindication of the custom would scarcely be listened to, for a moment, at this day. And yet, it will be found, on examination, to contain some thoughts on the subject, which it might be much easier to deride, than to answer. In one particular, it is most triumphant. It exposes, without mercy, the despicable inconsistency of those who were loudest in the condemnation of the practice. "This lord," he says, "and others, who would not have ministers meddle with civil affairs, are content, not only to the disgrace of the ministry, but even of religion itself, to hear felt-

¹ Strafford's Letters, &c. vol. i. p. 438.

² Clarendon, vol. i. p. 175, 176. Oxford edition.

³ Laud's Remains, vol. ii. p. 19—54.

makers, and ironmongers, and gardeners, and brewers' clerks, and coachmen, preach God knows what stuff, and countenance them in this sacrilegious presumption : *nay, and are never troubled that these men have all their time taken up in the affairs of the world ; but, rather, say their gifts are greater, and they are able to do both.* Out of doubt, they hope that their coachman-preachers shall hurry them to heaven in some fiery chariot. And I myself, in time, might be brought to think so too, did I not see Phaeton setting the Christian world on fire ; but no Elias there !” That the puritanical ministers were not remarkably fastidious, in digressing from their sacred calling, we have, further, the testimony of Hacket, the biographer of Bishop Williams ; who observes, that many of the zealots in England were abundantly ready to serve their own turn, by entangling themselves in secular matters. “I never saw any of our ministry,” he says, “more abstracted from their studies, (constantly propping at the Parliament door, and in Westminster Hall, for many years together, having no calling but that of an evil spirit to raise sedition,) than those who were most offended at a Bishop, for bestowing some part of his time in a secular place ².” In truth, it must have required the most consummate effrontery, for the Puritans to complain of worldly, ambitious, and intriguing churchmen. For nothing is more notorious than the fact, that, of all the agents of revolution, none were more busy or more unscrupulous than the disaffected ministers. Neither can it be denied, that the sway of Marshall and Burgess with

¹ Laud's Remains, p. 24, 25.

² Hacket, pt. i. p. 56.

the revolutionary faction, was far more powerful, than the influence of Laud had ever been, in the counsels of the King; or that Henderson was much more deeply involved in temporal affairs, than all the Bishops of Scotland together¹.

With regard to the conduct pursued by the Archbishop as a statesman, the question naturally presents itself, was he, or was he not, in his heart, a deliberate foe to the liberties and religion of his country? Now, in dealing with this question, it may be premised, that nothing could be more rash or foolish than to undertake a vindication of all his measures. It would, indeed, be a desperate adventure, to defend every article of his political creed. His greatest admirers will never maintain, that his theory of the constitution was otherwise than dangerous. Neither do they delight in the spectacle of Episcopacy invested with the robe of political and religious inquisition. They reflect with no complacency on the apparition of a churchman, holding the crozier in one hand, and the seals of civil office in the other. And they heartily rejoice that the elements of our polity have fallen into a combination, which can scarcely ever produce, or endure, a repetition of such phænomena. But these avowals are perfectly consistent with a deep respect for his memory, and with an aversion for the virulent and contemptuous spirit with which his name has been so frequently assailed.

With respect to his alleged political delinquencies, the case appears to lie within a very narrow compass. His own natural temper, we have seen, was somewhat arbitrary and austere. He could look with no

¹ Clarendon, vol. ii. p. 25.

indulgence on whatever tended towards anarchy and confusion. His principles as a churchman were in harmony with this disposition. As he, and as most other divines, then read the Scriptures, rebellion was one form of impiety; and resistance to the prince was treason against heaven. No wonder, then, that he watched, with emotions of dismay, the spirit which was abroad; and which, as he believed, was threatening the Church and the Monarchy with destruction. No wonder, if he wrought himself into a conviction that "thorough," and decisive measures were required, to guard from invasion the legal rights of the throne, and to preserve the empire from ruin and dishonour. It would be mere infatuation to affirm that his views, as a statesman, or a minister, were always wise, or that his mode of prosecuting them was uniformly prudent. A burning zeal, and a choleric temperament, too frequently overpowered his better judgment, and sometimes exposed him to public detestation. Among other examples of this, may be noticed his vote against one Chambers, a merchant, who was prosecuted in the Star-chamber, in 1629, for complaining, in no measured language, of the vexatious exactions he had suffered from the inferior officers of the revenue. Laud, then Bishop of London, was for a fine of £3000; which, at last, was lowered to £2000. This is among the instances usually produced to show, that he was, in his heart, an unfeeling tyrant. But it is, generally, forgotten, that he did not vote alone. Six other most distinguished members of the Court were for the same enormous penalty. It is, likewise, forgotten that Laud, whether justly or not, was persuaded that the very existence of the monarchy was placed in jeopardy by the spirit of con-

tumacious resistance to the demands of the public service, and that he expressed himself to this effect, on this very occasion¹. And, hence it is, that his severity was ascribed, not to his excess of zeal, but to a cankered and malignant heart. The opinion of Judge Whitelock was far nearer the truth. He said of Laud, long before his highest advancement, that he was a good and righteous man; but so full of fire, that his heat would probably set the kingdom in a flame². By many, his violence has been ascribed to a deliberate and traitorous design against the fundamental laws of his country. It surely would be more just to say, that his design was to support the fundamental laws, as they were understood, not only by himself, but by many other illustrious men of his own day. And they who hate his memory most bitterly, must allow that his purposes were wholly untainted with sordid and worldly wisdom. He followed his convictions, such as they were, honestly, faithfully, and courageously. No perversion has yet been able to defraud him of the praise of disinterestedness, or to fix upon him the guilt of selfish duplicity and falsehood.

The cordial sincerity with which he contended for the doctrine of what is called passive obedience, was manifested by him, even in the very jaws of destruction. He then, as on all occasions, verified to the full what was said of him by Sir Edward Dering, (whose fate it was to strike the first blow at him,) that he was always one and the same man; that, begin with him at Oxford, and so go on to Canterbury, he would be found

¹ State Trials, vol. iii. p. 374, &c.

² Echard's History of England, vol. i. p. 420. b. State Trials, vol. iv. col. 603. See Whitelock's Mem. April 13th, 1640, p. 32.

unmoved and unchanged. In the answer which he drew up to the charges of the Scots, he resolutely maintains the unlawfulness of resistance to constituted authority. He does not appear to consider it at all as a questionable matter. Though the enemy was boarding him, he never thought, for a moment, of hauling down these obnoxious colours. The Scots had complained that, "for their protestations, and other *lawful* means which they had used for their deliverance, Canterbury procured them to be proclaimed rebels." That he procured them to be proclaimed rebels, he positively denies. That he considered them, and spoke of them, as rebels, he broadly admits. "Truly," he says, "I know of no *lawful* means that they used, but taking up arms against the King! And I, for my part, do not conceive that to be lawful for subjects to do, *in any cause* of religion or otherwise. *And this, I am sure, was the ancient Christian doctrine* They say that I did openly and often speak of them, as rebels and traitors. That, indeed, is true. I did so. And I spake of them, as I then thought, and as I think still. For it was as desperate a plotted treason as ever was, in any nation. And if they did not think so themselves, what needed their act of oblivion in Scotland? or the like in England, to secure their abettors here¹?" It would be a great mistake, to imagine that this passage is produced, with the expectation, or the wish, that the doctrine in question may find grace in the sight of the present generation. It is adverted to, purely as indicating the high integrity, and the noble and unabated courage, of the aged

¹ Troubles, p. 125, 126.

prelate ; his profound reliance on the truth of his own principles ; and his belief that the times demanded an open profession of those principles, even to the death.

The notions entertained by Laud respecting the extent of the royal prerogative, are, in like manner, such as show him to have taken his stand as it were on an old entrenched position, while the national mind was moving irresistibly onward, towards another state of things. His views upon this subject will be best expounded in his own words. His language, it is true, is widely different from that of the constitution as finally modelled, in 1688 ; but it is such language as was spoken, at that day, by multitudes, who had no fixed hatred of liberty, and no attachment to tyrannical government.

“ I did never,” says he, “ advise his majesty that he might, at his own pleasure, levy money on his subjects, without their consent in Parliament. Nor do I remember that ever I affirmed any such thing as is charged in the article. But I do believe, I may have said something to the effect following : that howsoever it stands with the law of God, for a King, in the just and necessary defence of himself and his kingdom, to levy money of his subjects, yet when a particular national law doth intervene in any kingdom, and is settled by mutual consent of the King and his people, these monies ought to be levied by and according to that law. And by God’s law, and the same law of the land, I humbly conceive, the subjects so met in Parliament ought to supply their Prince, when there is just and necessary cause. And if an absolute necessity do happen, *by invasion, or otherwise, which gives no time for councils or law*, such a necessity,

—*but no pretended one*—is above all law. And I have heard the greatest lawyers in the kingdom confess, that, *in times of such necessity*, the King's prerogative is as great as this¹."

Precisely similar to this is the language of the Earl of Strafford, in a Letter addressed by him to Mr. Justice Hutton. "I do conceive," he says, "that the power of levies of forces, at sea and land, for the very, not feigned, relief and safety of the public, is such a property of sovereignty, as, were the crown willing, yet it cannot divest itself of. *Salus Populi, Suprema Lex* : nay, in cases of extremity, above acts of Parliament." Again, "It is a safe rule for us all, in the fear of God, to remit these supreme watches to that regal power, whose peculiar indeed, it is : to submit ourselves, in these high considerations, to his ordinances, as being no other than the ordinance of God himself²."

Now, in this age, no intelligent person could be found in England, to speak of these views of prerogative, and divine right, otherwise than as he would speak of the *primum mobile*, or of nature's abhorrence of a vacuum, or any other long-exploded absurdity. But the question is,—not so much whether these doctrines are right or wrong,—as, whether the progress of our institutions has brought us to an elevation, from which we may lawfully utter maledictions, against all who may have been misled by such false notions, during a more imperfect condition of political science.

But, we must hasten to a moment's consideration of the Archbishop's ecclesiastical government. For,

¹ History of Troubles, &c. c. vii. p. 150.

² Strafford's Letters, &c. vol. ii. p. 388. Sept. 13, 1639.

it is here, that the evil qualities of his mind are supposed to have been most hatefully manifested. He has been painted not only as the presiding demon of the Star-chamber, but, as the Arch-fiend of the English Inquisition ; as the monster that never was at rest, unless he had Puritans to pillory and to mangle. On this matter, a word or two may be expedient ; because it may be suspected, that, to this hour, there is much confusion of thought prevailing, relative to the subject, notwithstanding all that has been said or written upon it.

It must be remembered, then, that the administration of the Church, in those days, involved two objects, in themselves distinct, though often much entangled with each other. The first was, the treatment of such persons as came under the general description of Sectarians or Separatists. The second, the exaction of uniformity in the celebration of divine worship, within the established Church.

Now, with regard to the former of these two objects, it is scarcely possible, at this day, for any one to open his lips in palliation of the conduct of such men as Bancroft or of Laud, without some danger of being saluted with a shout of derision and mockery. We live, now, in an age of toleration, which recognizes the right of every individual to leave the Church for the Conventicle, and the Conventicle for the Church ; or, to divide his favours impartially between them ; or, to abandon the Church and the Conventicle altogether. The consequence is, that most men have well nigh lost the faculty of comprehending how there ever could have been a time, when it was thought lawful and right to punish, or to molest, individuals, for worshipping God according to the dictates of their conscience, or their caprice. It is

needful, therefore, to remind them that there *have* been such times ; and that, as the law then stood, it fell within the positive duty of ecclesiastical governors to animadvert upon revolt from the National Communion. It must, further, be acknowledged that these rulers sometimes addressed themselves to the discharge of this duty with a zeal and ardour scarcely credible in these days ; and that their proceedings were, occasionally, such as must wear a fierce, unfeeling aspect, when examined by the light which we now enjoy. Neither must it be forgotten, that such severities were sometimes loudly called for by the popular voice ; and that, if they had been directed against none but Papists and Arminians, they not only would have escaped the censures of the Puritanical party, but would have been hailed by them with clamorous approbation. It must, lastly, be stated, that the tribunal before which those proceedings were chiefly carried on, was the Court of High Commission ; a Court, for which (in spite of the abuses which latterly disfigured it) much more might be said, than our space will allow, or the temper of the present age would, probably, endure ; but which has, since, together with the Star-chamber, been indignantly swept away from the constitution.

It is true, that these restraints were not very patiently endured ; and by none more impatiently than by those very parties, who hotly desired to inflict the same coercion, themselves, and whose fingers were actually quivering with eagerness to grasp the two-edged sword of temporal and spiritual authority. It has been said by Warburton, that Laud was not only for an arbitrary King, but for an intolerant Church ! If the Prelates were for an intolerant Church, that many-headed Bishop, the Presbytery, was for a

Church beyond all comparison more intolerant. Every reader of the history of those times must know, that the persecuted saints detested the rulers of the Episcopal Establishment, not merely as tyrants, but as usurpers. They looked forward with earnest expectation to that blessed period, when the secular arm should be at the command of God's elect, and execute his righteous judgments against heretics, *Prelatists*, and all other enemies of holiness. A system of indulgence and toleration they loudly scorned. They denounced it, as an abomination and a snare; as no less than a perfidious abandonment of the cause of truth. And, when their day was come, most luminous and faithful was their *practical* commentary upon the texts which had been perpetually in their mouths¹. All this is perfectly notorious. And all this was the natural result of that disregard for the rights of conscience, which, then, was all but universal. Why, then, we may demand, should men like Laud be made *a hissing and a curse*? as if intolerance had been, exclusively, the vice of the Establishment; as if the Sectarians sought nothing but the peaceable enjoyment of their own discipline and doctrine; as if the faction which cried out against the inhuman bigotry of the Church, were not intent upon the moment when they might seize on a monopoly in the privilege of persecution.

¹ "The little finger of Presbytery, and Independency," says Gauden, "with the warts and wens of other factions growing upon them, have been heavier upon the *Episcopal*, (which was the only *legal* Clergy of England, of late years,) than the loins of any sober and godly Bishops, whatsoever, in any age: yea, and equal to the burdens of the most passionate and immoderate Bishops, whatsoever." Gauden's Tears, &c. p. 227. This is the language of truth; albeit it comes from the pen of Gauden!

An enforcement of uniformity, in the services and ceremonies of the Church, formed another department of ecclesiastical administration: and it would be difficult to imagine anything much more unreasonable, than a clamour against the hierarchy for a firm and temperate discharge of their duty. That we may be able to comprehend this, the more clearly, let us consider, for a moment, what we should think of any Bishop, in modern days, who should surrender the rites and formularies of the Church to the caprices or the scruples, which might, at any time, be wandering up and down his diocese? What should we say, if he were to suffer his Clergy to use, or to omit, at their pleasure, the cross in baptism, or the ring in matrimony, or the surplice at the desk or altar; or, should allow the communion-table to be dragged from the eastern wall into the middle of the Church? And what right could men, whether lay or clerical, have to murmur against the supreme authorities for enforcing, in these particulars, the laws of the land, and the usages and canons of the Establishment? But, upon this matter, let us hear the Archbishop himself. "All I laboured for in this particular was, that the external worship of God in this Church, might be kept up in uniformity and decency, and in some beauty of holiness. And this the rather, because first I found that, from the contempt of the outward worship of God, the inward fell away apace, and profaneness began boldly to show itself. And, secondly, because I could speak with no conscientious persons, almost, that were wavering in religion, but the great motive which wrought upon them to disaffect, or think meanly of the Church of England, was that the external worship of God was so lost in the Church, (as they conceived it,) and

the churches themselves, and all things in them suffered to lye in such a base and slovenly fashion in most places of the kingdom. These, and no other considerations, moved me to take so much care as I did of it; which was with a single eye, and most free from any Romish superstition. *As for ceremonies, all that I enjoined were according to law*¹."

It was, unhappily, the fate of Laud to succeed a prelate, whose views and principles were widely different from his own. In the first place, the theology of Abbot was, notoriously, Calvinistic. And secondly, it is undeniable that the external decencies and solemnities of religion engaged, comparatively, but little of his solicitude and respect. There is, probably, some exaggeration in the statements which have reached us, relative to the general remissness of his administration. But, still, it remains unquestionable, that in some departments, he suffered an unseemly dilapidation of the discipline of the Church. He allowed the sacred edifices to become so ruinous and filthy, that they almost caused the service of the Lord to be abhorred by every one, except that party who looked up to him as their patron and protector. In short, he had allowed so much disorder to rush in, that Laud felt himself called upon to perform, as it were, a lustration of the sanctuary: and the ignorant rabble were, therefore, taught to curse him, not only as the minister of tyranny, but as the hierophant of superstition. The cry went forth that he was a Popish innovator: whereas, the very worst that could righteously be said of him, was, that he was a hasty and impetuous reformer. It appears, from his own repeated declarations, that Bishop Andrews was his model. And, from all that is known of that eminent divine, it may

¹ Troubles, &c.

confidently be presumed that, if he had succeeded to the primacy, (which, at one time, was very likely,) he would have attempted all that was actually attempted by Laud. But neither can it be reasonably doubted, that Andrews would have brought with him a spirit of much greater caution and moderation to the work. He would have laboured to restore the outward proprieties of worship, by a more gentle and conciliatory process. The fault of Laud was, that his honest zeal impelled him to proceed too rigorously, and too imperiously; and to venture on too sudden a revival of some practices, which had been allowed to sink into almost general disuse. And hence it was, that the Archbishop was charged by his adversaries with a sort of *cumulative* popery; just as he was, afterwards, accused of *cumulative* treason. He was loaded with the infamy of a design to work up the Church of England, by little and little, to a conformity with Rome; and to lay, once more, upon her neck, the yoke which the martyrs and confessors of the reformation had enabled her to shake off.

It was another serious accusation against Laud, that he cruelly vexed and persecuted the painful and godly ministers of the Gospel. The plain truth of this matter is, that he used, without sparing, the power which the law placed in his hands, for the suppression of polemical and inflammatory preaching; which was, then, prodigally employed to send throughout the kingdom a spirit of frantic disaffection towards the hierarchy and the throne. If the sanctuary were, now, to be desecrated by similar abuses, the case would, assuredly, be fit for the paternal castigation of the diocesan; or, for the cognizance of the grand jury; or, perhaps, for the more vigorous good offices of his Majesty's Attorney-general. It can never,

without imminent danger to the public peace, be endured, that virulent libels against the Church and state should, systematically, issue from the chair of spiritual instruction; or that the pulpit should be converted into the *rostrum* of sedition¹. It may be true that the tribunal often resorted to for the punishment of such outrages, had become formidably adverse to the liberties of the country. But it would be the consummation of all injustice, to make Laud answerable for the vices of its constitution. But on this point, again, let us hear him speak for himself.

“I have not by myself, nor by my command to my officers, silenced, suspended, deprived, degraded, or excommunicated any learned, pious, and orthodox preachers, but upon just cause proved in court, *and according to law* Nor have I, by their suspensions, hindered the preaching of God’s word, but of *schism and sedition*; as now appears plainly by the sermons frequently made in London² since the time of liberty given and taken, since this parliament first began And whereas in their late remonstrance they say—*the high commission grew to such excess of sharpness and severity as was not much less than the Romish Inquisition, and yet, in many cases, by the Archbishop’s power was made much more heavy, being assisted and strengthened by the authority of the council table*—I was much troubled at it, that such an imputation from so great a body should be fastened on me Therefore, to satisfy myself and others in this particular, I did cause a diligent search to be

¹ We know at this day, by bitter experience, the effects of suffering the Romish altar to be converted into a rostrum of sedition!

² A very curious collection of specimens of puritanical eloquence may be found in Nicoll’s “Arminianism and Calvinism compared.”

made in the acts of that court, (which can deceive no man,) what suspensions, deprivations, and other punishments had passed in the seven years of my time before my commitment. *Then I compared them with every one of the three seven years of my immediate predecessor (Abbot)—for so long he sat, and somewhat over, and was in great esteem with the House of Commons all his time—and I find more by three suspended, deprived, or degraded, in every seven years of his time, than in the seven years of my time, so cried out upon for sharpness and severity, even to the equalling of that commission almost to the Romish Inquisition. So safe a thing it is for a man to embark himself into a potent faction; and so hard for any other man, be he never so intire, to withstand its violence¹.*"

We should hardly have been tempted to advert to these topics so much at length, if it were not often, and confidently, asserted, that the schism about trifles, in the time of Elizabeth and the first Stuarts, was converted, by *persecution*, into a systematic political opposition. It is necessary to protest against this averment, as egregiously insidious and unjust; as tending to arm all the resentments of mankind against the hierarchy, and to engage all their sympathies on the part of the non-conformists and sectarians. It would be a much more righteous statement of the case, to say, that the opposition in question was, mainly, the result of a struggle for existence on the part of the Anglican Church, and for supremacy on the part of the ultra-Protestants. The mal-content faction was, for a time, defeated; and of course, it was filled with "unconquerable hate;" and became, at length, the natural sanctuary for all the turbulence

¹ Troubles, &c p. 163, 164.

and disaffection which, before, might happen to be afloat in the political system. And, hence, the conflict which terminated in the overthrow of the Church and Monarchy. That Calvinism, and Presbyterianism, and Independency, are no very destructive plagues at the present day, has often been asserted : and, within certain limits, the assertion may be true. Time and circumstances may have done much to tame them. At the period in question, however, their talons were sharp, and their fangs venomous, and their temper desperately savage. It was necessary to protect the public against their furious aggressions ; and the measures taken for this purpose, were not so much measures of persecution, as measures of precaution and of self-defence. Whether, or not, the struggle was maintained by Laud, and other rulers of the Church, with greater keenness of spirit, and violence of action, than the perils of the time demanded, is a vast and complicated question, which, perhaps, no human sagacity will ever completely set at rest. Of one thing, however, there can be no reasonable doubt, that the severities actually inflicted were most unscrupulously exaggerated by the clamours of the suffering party ¹.

In truth, the furious outcry raised by the Calvinistic

¹ We are told, for instance, in a work entitled *Altare Damascenum*, that, in Bancroft's time, no less than three hundred preaching ministers had been silenced or deprived ! Whereas, it appears, from the Rolls produced by Bancroft, before his death, that only forty-nine had been deprived, *on all occasions*, out of our nine or ten thousand parishes ; and that even this measure of severity was, for the time, so successful, that non-conformity grew out of fashion. Heylyn, *Aërius Redivivus*, p. 376.

It has already been stated, that, when Bishop Wren was charged with atrocious persecution, he, likewise, exposed the calumny, by the production of his registers.

faction of that age, against Archbishop Laud, as a *Popish* persecutor, furnishes us with a singular illustration of the deceitfulness of the human heart, or of the hardness of the human forehead. For, of all the repulsive peculiarities of the holy discipline, as it exhibited itself in his time, there was none, perhaps, so remarkable, as its coarse, hard-featured resemblance to that very *Popery*, which was the object of its professed abhorrence. The Presbyterian system was, in its original principles, as sternly and avowedly intolerant as the pontifical chair. It extended no hope of salvation, beyond the pale of its own communion. It affected a dominion, paramount to all earthly magistracy. It proclaimed a war of extermination against heresy. It was ready to compass earth and sea for proselytes. Violence and terror were employed to establish its claim to infallibility. And if *Popery* had its council of Trent, Calvinism had its synod of Dort. If it abjured the idolatry of the mass, it may fairly be said to have found a substitute, in the ordinance of preaching¹: for to the

¹ The almost superstitious estimation in which preaching was held by the Puritans, is thus adverted to by Laud in his conference:

“ I have often heard some wise men say, that the Jesuit in the Church of Rome and the precise party in the Reformed Churches agree in many things, though they would seem most to differ. And surely this is one: for both of them differ extremely about tradition; the one in magnifying it, and exalting it into Divine authority; the other vilifying it, and depressing it almost beneath human. And yet, even in these different ways, both agree in this consequent: *that the sermons and preachings by word of mouth of the lawfully sent pastors and doctors of the Church, are able to breed in us Divine and infallible faith; nay, are the very word of God.* And no less than so, have some accounted their own fac-

Presbyterian, the sermon was almost as much the life and soul of public worship, as the sacrifice of the eucharist was to the Romanist. If it renounced altogether the *merit* of ritual performances, it seemed to indemnify itself, by setting up, instead, the *merit* of neglecting them. If the Pope claimed power to hurl monarchs from their thrones, the Presbytery, in like manner, held itself commissioned to denounce them as traitors to the majesty of the people, and enemies to God. If the Pope could proclaim, that to keep faith with heretics, was to be false to the Church, the Presbytery could declare, precisely in the same spirit, that oaths were nullities, whenever they tended to the detriment of the holy cause. Nay, if the Pontiff grasped the keys of St. Peter, the Presbytery wielded the sceptre of Christ himself. And, lastly, to complete the similitude, if the Romish discipline transferred the care of his own conscience from the sinner to the priest, very similar to this was the effect of the system of Geneva: as we may distinctly learn from the representation of it by Milton; who has left us a picture of the domestic *conscience-keeper*, touched with inimitable force of caustic humour¹. Such being

tious words as the word of God And it may be observed too, that no men are more apt to say that all the Fathers were but men, and might err, than they that think their own preachings are infallible."—*Conference with Fisher*, p. 100.

¹ As the prose works of Milton are not, now, in the hands of every one, we are quite certain that our readers will be glad to see this picture introduced here:—"A man may be a heretic in the truth; and if he believe things *only* because his pastor says so, or the Assembly so determines, without knowing other reason, though his belief be true, yet the very truth he holds becomes his heresy. There is not any burden that some would gladlier put off to another, than the charge and care of their religion.

the notorious character and tendency of the Calvinistic fanaticism, *in that age*, we may readily imagine the indignation of the *Arminian*, Laud, on finding himself assailed and hunted down as a confederate of the old *persecuting* religion. The preceding narrative of his life, will enable us to trace the rise and progress of this slander. And every one, conversant with those times, must now perceive, that to charge him with a design to subvert the religion of the reformation, would be about as reasonable, as to affirm

There be—who knows not that there be?—of *Protestants and professors, who live in as arrant and implicit faith, as any lay Papist of Loretto*. A wealthy man, addicted to his pleasures and to his profits, finds religion to be a traffic so entangled, and of so many peddling accounts, that, of all mysteries, he cannot skill to keep a stock going upon that trade. What should he do? Fain would he have the name to be religious, fain he would bear up with his neighbours in that. What does he, therefore, but resolves to give over toiling, and to find himself out some factor, to whose care and credit he may commit the whole managing of his religious affairs; some divine of note and estimation that must be. To him he adheres, resigns the whole warehouse of his religion, with all the locks and keys, into his custody; and, indeed, makes the very person of that man his religion; esteems his associating with him a sufficient evidence and commendatory of his own piety. So that a man might say, his religion is now no more within himself, but is become an individual moveable, and goes and comes near him, according as that good man frequents the house. He entertains him, gives him gifts, feasts him, lodges him. His religion comes home at night, prays, is liberally supped, and sumptuously laid to sleep; rises, is saluted; and (after the malmsey, or some well-spiced brewage, and better breakfasted than He, whose morning appetite would have gladly fed on green figs between Bethany and Jerusalem) his religion walks abroad at eight, and leaves his kind entertainer in the shop,—trading without his religion!" Milton's *Areopag. Prose Works* v. i. p. 316, Ed. Symm. This was written in 1645, when the Church was depressed, and the Presbyterian system triumphant.

that he was a party to the gunpowder plot. The calumny, however, did its office. The falsehood was eminently serviceable in its day. In the first place, it helped to prepare the public mind for the overthrow of the Church, which he ruled,—and, with it, of the throne, which he faithfully served. And, secondly, (as he himself complains,) it contributed more to his own personal ruin, than double of all the other machinations against him. Even at this hour, it carries on a sort of ambushed warfare against his fame. The hasty and superficial student of history is still apt to rise with a secret, undefined impression, that there must, after all, have been something fatally unsound in the religious principles of a man, who, all his life long, was gored and worried by a faction, which seemed to be incessantly thirsting for the blood of Papists.

Among the circumstances which contributed to fix upon the Archbishop the imputation of a secret attachment to Rome, may be reckoned the indulgence occasionally shown to the Papists during his administration. But, no one, who has the slightest acquaintance with the history of those times, can possibly be misled by this strange and very reprehensible perversion. It was, notoriously, the policy of Elizabeth, of James, and of Charles, to let the laws against the Romanists sleep, until they were awakened by machinations which savoured of treason, rather than of heresy : and, in this respect, those sovereigns were far advanced beyond the intolerant notions of their times. It must, further, be remembered, that the Protestants of England, who were loudest in their outcry for the persecution of Papists, were equally loud in their demand for the intercessions of the English government, in behalf of the suffering Pro-

testants of France ; and that these intercessions were always answered by similar demands, on the part of the French court, in favour of the suffering Romanists in England. This brief and indisputable statement must, surely, be sufficient to dispose of a large portion of the calumnies then vented against Archbishop Laud ; and against all, who, like him, had to rule the Church of England, in times of unexampled difficulty and embarrassment.

Another circumstance which in his own times, greatly strengthened the belief of his apostacy, was the offer of a Cardinal's hat, made to him on the very morning that his predecessor expired. The affair, unquestionably, has, at first sight, a very strange appearance : and, to our apprehension, the mystery is not cleared up by the language and demeanour of the Archbishop, on the occasion. If, in this age, a person, professing to be an emissary of Rome, were to wait on the Primate of all England, with a similar proposal, his Grace would, of course, lose no time in dismissing the man, with all imaginable courtesy ; and having, done so, he would, doubtless, congratulate himself on having got rid of a visitor not altogether in his right mind. Nothing could be more different from this, than the conduct of Laud. He seems to have betrayed neither astonishment, nor indignation, nor disturbance of any kind. He calmly replied to the person who came to him, in secret, with the offer, that "something dwelled within him, which would not suffer that, till Rome was otherwise than it was at that present time ¹." To us, such an answer must appear strangely ambiguous and faint. We,

¹ Diary, p. 49.

perhaps, should have expected that he would meet the proposal much in the same manner that St. Basil, or St. Ambrose, would have received an offer of election into the College of *Augurs*, or the fraternity of *Flamens* or *Pontifices*. Whereas, the tone of his refusal seems to imply, that there was nothing extravagantly absurd in the arrangement, and that, if Rome would but submit to some material reforms in her system, the Archbishop of Canterbury might, without any violation of consistency, become a member of the sacred conclave.

The seeming faintness of Laud's refusal will, however, appear much less extraordinary, when it is remembered that even his adversary and rival, Bishop Williams, was, at one time, suspected of positively aspiring to the same Popish honour; and that there is very substantial evidence to show this suspicion to have been well-founded¹. A little reflection may be sufficient for the explanation of such facts as these: which, otherwise, might seem almost inexplicable. In these times, a reconciliation between the Romish and the Reformed Communions, would be thought scarcely less chimerical, than a coalition

¹ We learn from Hacket, in his *Life of Williams*, pt. i. p. 93, 94. that, in 1622, a Cardinal's hat was rumoured to have been actually offered to Williams. And, in a Manuscript of the Earl of Leycester, in the British Museum, it is asserted that, when Williams was Lord Keeper, he tried to be made a Cardinal, by Buckingham's interest; and, further, that this statement was solemnly confirmed by Endymion Porter, who, at that time, was in the service of Buckingham: which shows, says the Earl, what an excellent conscience Williams had; desiring to be a Cardinal when he was in favour, and betaking himself to the Puritans, when he was in disgrace. See Blencowe's *Sidney Papers*, p. 261—263. Note (a.)

between the religion of the Cross, and that of the Crescent. A Protestant *Cardinal* sounds, to our ears, almost as odd, as a Christian *Imám*. But, in the time of Laud and Williams, the case was widely different. The breach between the Churches was, then, by no means universally regarded as altogether desperate¹. It was, indeed, a most tremendous schism; but one which, (according to the views of many,) it was not wholly beyond the power of wisdom and charity to repair. And, to an ardent wish for its reparation, we may principally ascribe the

¹ In the Harleian MSS. 3142, is a curious Letter to King James, from a Dr. Carier, who had been converted to Romanism; in which, the writer says, "The reasons, or rather corruptions of the State, have so confounded the doctrine of the Church of England, and so slandered the Church of Rome, as it hath turned men's brains; and made the multitude on both sides, like two fools, who being set back to back, do think they are as far asunder, as the horizons that they look upon. But, if it might please your Majesty to command them to turn but a quarter about, and look both one way, to the service of God and your Majesty, and to the salvation of souls; they should, presently, see themselves to be a great deal more near together, in matters of doctrine, than the puritanical preachers, on both sides, do make them believe they are."

The prevalent feeling, that the breach with Rome was not absolutely irreparable, may help to account for the very courteous and complimentary style of intercourse which was occasionally kept up with her by some distinguished Protestants. Sully relates, (vol. iv. p. 20, English Translation,) that he received from Paul V. a singularly flattering epistle, conceived in the strongest terms of esteem and admiration, but expressive of ardent wishes for his conversion. On the topic of conversion, Sully, in reply, says not one syllable; but, in the matter of compliment, he pays his holiness in his own coin; and even talks of the honour of *kissing his feet*: a strain of civility which, he confesses, might rather discompose his Protestant friends. It is well known that James I. considered himself as a sort of martyr

fact, that the *Canterburian* divines, (as they were called,) ventured to put forth some divinity, in which certain Romish practices and opinions were treated with more of tenderness and indulgence, than would now be thought defensible¹. It is probable, indeed, that no serious thoughts of compromise or union were ever entertained, at Rome. But the mother and mistress of all Churches would have strangely forgotten her cunning, had she proclaimed to the world, that the gates of reconciliation were shut for ever; or, had she renounced the advantage, likely to

—certainly not less than a confessor—of the Protestant faith; and yet did the Pope invite this Protestant confessor to send his son, prince Henry, to Rome, for the completion of his education; a proposal which, though declined, was declined with courtesy. It will also be recollected that Charles I. addressed the Pope in a style which, in the present day, would hardly be regarded as consistent with sincere Protestantism. Now all this leering and ogling between Rome and her revolted subjects could hardly have taken place, if reconciliation had been considered as something perfectly visionary, and beyond the pale of possibility.

¹ In the Collection of Pamphlets, given by George III. to the British Museum, vol. cxxix. No. 3. 4to. London, 1643, is an "Examination of the Life of Laud," by Robert Bayley, the Scottish Commissioner. It contains very copious quotations from the writings of the "*Canterburian Divines.*" In the whole of these quotations, Bayley, of course, sees nothing but Popery; and this, too, in a multitude of instances, where the soundest divines of the present day would discover no Popery at all. Some hazardous and indiscreet passages, however, he undoubtedly has produced. So that Heylyn, who stood forth as the apologist of those writers, was compelled to admit, that "swelling words" had been written by them, upon some topics,—such as the honour due to the Virgin Mary, to Saints, Images, Reliques, &c. But their chief object manifestly was, to show that these were not matters which ought to cause an *irreparable* schism.

result to her from an attempt, which might end in a more full exposure of the disunion of her enemies. There was nothing, therefore, in the proposal to Laud, which was at all contrary to her policy. And it had, moreover, this signal recommendation—that, whatever might be its success, the very offer itself would, probably, throw suspicion and discredit on one, whom she notoriously hated, as her most formidable adversary.

The above considerations may be sufficient to render the whole of the above transaction quite intelligible. They may help both to account for the offer itself, and to explain the reception given to it by the Archbishop. The proposal was, certainly, not treated by him, as it would be now. He did not repel it as an insult. He did not reject it as a visionary scheme. He calmly intimated that a great change must take place in Rome, before an Anglican Prelate could become a member of her hierarchy. And there can be no question, that, when he gave this answer, he contemplated, with perfect integrity of heart, the possibility, at least, of such a coalition, as might enable a Protestant Churchman to accept, without breach of conscience, the patronage of the Roman Pontiff. In his reply to that article of impeachment, which charged him with a traitorous attempt to reconcile the two Churches, he most distinctly avows that he did both wish and labour for such a reconciliation. He declares, that he ever prayed heartily for the unity of the whole Church of Christ, and for the peace of torn and divided Christendom. His desire was, that England and Rome might meet together, provided that their union could be accomplished without a sacrifice of truth,

or an abandonment of foundations. If this could be done, God forbid, he exclaims, but I should labour for a reconciliation. The language in which he proceeds to repel the imputation of a traitorous design against the Protestant faith, is such as might be expected to burst from a heart outraged beyond all endurance, by the remorseless iniquity of his oppressors : “ I do here make my solemn protestation, in the presence of God, and of this great Court, that I am innocent of any thing, greater or less, that is charged in this article, or in any part of it Let nothing be tendered against me, but the truth, and I do challenge whatsoever is between heaven and hell, to come in, and witness whatever is against me in this particular ¹.”

But, although Laud thus openly and intrepidly avowed his desire for a reconciliation, which might concede to Rome a precedency of honor among the Christian Churches, we find that, at last, he had but little hope of success. He was apprehensive—as he declares—that “ some tenets of the Roman party, on the one side, and some deep and embittered disaffection on the other,” had rendered the design impracticable. But, hopeless as the attempt might be, it still is most revolting to see an Archbishop of Canterbury pursued, and overwhelmed with obloquy, for a charitable project, which had the good wishes of many illustrious men ; and which was actually revived by another Primate ², though with no better success, in the following century.

We might here introduce a vast mass of evidence, to show the absurdity of the supposition, that Laud

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 162.

² Archbishop Wake.

was in collusion with the Papacy, for the overthrow of the reformed faith in England. To say nothing of his controversy with Fisher,—we might advert to the individuals whom he preserved, or reclaimed, from Popery; to his letter to Sir Kenelm Digby, on his defection from the Church of England¹; and to his labours for the reconciliation of the Calvinists and Lutherans of Germany, with a view to more compact resistance against Rome². We might produce the opinions of many among his Protestant contemporaries,—the fact, that Con, the Papal Nuncio, could never obtain access to him³,—the incessant exhortations, with which he encouraged and incited Gerard Vossius, in the prosecution of his intended labours against Baronius⁴—the persuasion expressed by a *Father* of the English College at Rome, that the measures of Laud tended to the serious injury of the Papal Church, by attracting Romanists to the Church of England, instead of merging the Church of England in that of Rome⁵,—to the joy with which the intelligence of his death was received

¹ Troubles, &c. p. 418. 610.

² Above sixty letters were found in his study, relative to this design. Troubles, &c. p. 419.

³ See Rome's Masterpiece, at the end of Laud's Troubles, &c. Also Rushworth, vol. iii. p. 1320. 1327.

⁴ For instance; "I heartily approve your plan, with regard to Baronius. . . The main point is, to show, succinctly, in what particulars the Church of Rome has most widely receded from the primitive Church, and to confirm the statement by irrefragable arguments. Both of which, as I have always judged, will be of easy accomplishment to you." *Præst. Vir. Epist. No. 457. p. 732. (a)*. Again, "I never cease to press Baronius upon you." *Ibid, No. 505. p. 765. (a)*. These exhortations are perpetually reiterated in his correspondence.

⁵ Echard's Hist. of Engl. vol. i. p. 483.

by the Papists, who spoke of him as their most formidable enemy, in this country, and as the mightiest champion of the Anglican Church ¹. This, and a variety of similar proof, might easily be accumulated. But it would be almost superfluous; and would occupy much more space than this volume can afford.

One word must be said respecting the temper with which Laud endured the calumny and persecution which fell upon him. And for this we may appeal, in the first place, to the following testimony of Philip Limborch ². "The most reverend William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, who, on account of his religion, was beheaded by fiery zealots, here shows himself worthy of the highest admiration. Though attacked with grievous accusations, and loaded with numerous calumnies, in his most familiar letters to Vossius, he gives no utterance to curses against his ferocious enemies: but, imitating the example of his Saviour, when reviled he reviled not again; and, when attacked, he threatened not; but blessed them who cursed him, and poured forth the most ardent prayers for his persecutors." Now, even if the letters of the Archbishop to Vossius were not extant, to speak for themselves, the report of them, by Limborch, would be superior to all exception. It is true, that Limborch was an Arminian. But no man

¹ The testimony of Evelyn is peculiarly valuable. He was at Rome when a copy of Laud's speech on the scaffold arrived there. The English *Fathers* with whom he was in company read it, "and commented upon it with no small satisfaction and contempt: and looked upon him as one that was a great enemy to them, and stood in their way: while one of the blackest crimes imputed to him, was his being Popishly affected." Printed at the end of the "*Troubles, &c.*" p. 616.

² In his preface to the *Præstantium, &c. Epistolæ*.

was ever less disposed to sympathize with bigots. He was, notoriously, attached to the principles of toleration; and was the friend and correspondent of Locke. The letters of Laud to Vossius, however, have been preserved to us; and they amply support the description given by their learned editor. Several instances of this have been produced in the course of the preceding narrative. The following will furnish another illustration of his forbearance, at a moment when his evil days were approaching, and evil tongues were loudest against him. On the 31st August, 1640, he writes thus: "You are not ignorant of the great and bitter troubles brought upon us, in England, by the Scottish affairs. Whither the revolutionists—(*furiosi novatores*)—are tending, I well know. To what point they will actually advance, is known only to God. But, upon these matters, I have neither leisure, nor inclination, to write; lest my paper should be stained with gall. For I have learned that, even among foreigners, my name is torn to pieces by the calumnies of these men²." His usual prayer, when writing on similar occasions, is, that God would grant him patience, and forgive his enemies.

In conclusion, then, what is to be said of this man? Was he faithless to his country, or his God? Was he without all sense of moral and religious obligation? Was he agitated incessantly with the furies of a malignant temper? Was he a conspirator against the fundamental laws of England? Was he either a corrupter of the national faith, or a traitor to it? Or, if none of these, was he the driveller and the

¹ This is not from Limborch's collection, but from the correspondence of Vossius, edited by Colomesius, 1690; Epist. 300. p. 149.

dotard which, in later times, he has been represented? Was he, in short, as it has been affirmed, the monster or the idiot, on whom the Church, with maternal infatuation, has lavished her especial favor and protection?

A juster estimate than this may, surely, be formed of the worth of Archbishop Laud. In temper he was untractable; in manner, often impetuous and repulsive; in opinion, stiff and occasionally obstinate; in the discharge of public duty, stern, inflexible, and, doubtless, far too much disposed to extremities of rigour. His very virtues were, for the most part, of an austere and somewhat forbidding physiognomy. Both his excellences, and his failings, however, were intimately connected with a detestation of iniquity. He seems to have had no conception of a compromise with delinquency, whether in high places, or in low¹. He was prepared, at all times, to set his face, like a rock, against every quarter, from which he apprehended danger to the interests of virtue and religion, to the service of his King, and to the honor and stability of the church². And hence it was, that he provoked the anger of the Puritans, the pride and cupidity of the courtiers, and

¹ It has been said, that "his rigid honesty made him fit for primitive times; while Bishop Williams's policy taught him to manage the infirmities of his own. The one was fit to govern saints; the other to deal with men,—which is far the more difficult task. Laud had always the innocence of the dove, with not enough of the serpent's wisdom. Williams had very much of the latter; but, we have reason to fear, not the full perfection of the former." Echard's Hist. of England, vol. i. p. 421.

² Laud's own view of his Church policy, was briefly expressed by him to a friend, when he was in the Tower:—"I have endeavoured to repair an old house; but it fell to ruin about my ears!" *Ib.* p. 483. (a.)

(more bitter than all) the malignity of the Covenanting Scots. He abhorred and dreaded the demon which seemed to possess the people; but he was unable to cast it out: and, accordingly, the evil spirit leaped upon him, and overcame him, and prevailed against him. He despised the selfish arrogance of many among the aristocracy; and confronted it, perhaps, with too much of the pride of Churchmanship. He was, further, anxious that the discipline of the Church should be felt, as well as spoken of; and, therefore, he essayed to drag the vices of the great before the spiritual judgment-seat. And thus, he armed against himself principalities and powers of another kind: till, at last, the Court and faction were emulous of each other, in their zeal for his destruction. He, lastly, at the command of his sovereign, made a rash assault on the religious prepossessions of the Scottish nation: and this, at a time, when all the elements within her were ripe for commotion, at the very first signal. The weapon was, unhappily, launched at the flanks of a monster "teeming with arms." The presiding power was instantly and implacably incensed; and, shortly after, the ministers of vengeance were seen rolling towards him, to crush and to devour him.

In the midst of the perils with which his unflinching and stern integrity had surrounded him, his spirit never seems to have quailed for an instant. For years together, he heard the cry becoming deeper and deeper: but yet, his eye was ever steadily fixed upon his adversaries. His name was often placarded over the town, as an enemy to God and man: but there was within him a sense of duty to God and man, which, whether mistaken or not, kept him

unmoved, in the midst of the plague that walked in darkness, and the arrow that flew by noon¹. Even when the dogs of persecution were at his heels, his fortitude remained unshaken. He presented a firm and undaunted front, to the very last: and came forth to his death with the aspect of one who is conqueror, and more than conqueror. And, let it be remembered, that this was not the intrepidity of brutal hardihood; for his Diary speaks, at times, in the language of human apprehension, respecting the dangers that arrayed themselves against him; and it speaks too, in the language of heavenly forgiveness, of the fury of his enemies. Neither was his firmness the result of a robust constitution: for suffering and feebleness had been his portion from his earliest childhood. His was an interior courage, which made him strong in the midst of weakness, and gave him youth and lustihood, while bowing beneath the load of infirmity and age.

And does not his blood, even now, cry out of the dust against the wickedness which sought his life? And does it not cry, as loudly, in accents of warn-

¹ In the Mickleton and Spearman papers, in Bishop Cosin's Library, at Durham, are several letters of Laud to Bishop Morton; in one of which (46,30) he says, "your complaint is somewhat large, that there hath been sinister working against you, through the sides of others. *But your Lordship shall do well not to trouble yourself much with it.* For I know not that Bishop whose place calls him to do any thing, but he is so served,—so, at least! *But for myself, 'tis not only so; but, besides that, I am publicly laid at, on all hands, and have no fence but to bear it.*" In the same letter he remarks, "the times are so full of danger, as I know not whom to believe." Lambeth, October 19, 1639. The same sense of impending danger, and the same intrepid resolution, are frequently expressed in his Letters to J. G. Vossius.

ing to the men of the present generation ? And if we are deaf to that call, are there not sounds and voices now abroad to arouse us, from the visions of other times, to sights of present, and scarcely less appalling reality ? The reeking scaffold of Laud, the triumphs of a fanatical and sanguinary rabble, the spectacle of a prostrate throne, a ruined Church, and a persecuted hierarchy ; all these are, to many among us, like “the fierce vexation of a dream.” And when they awake, they find themselves in the midst of a scene that bears an aspect of solid and imperishable grandeur. The interval of two hundred years has, doubtless, developed our national resources, to an extent which our ancestors would have regarded as absolutely chimerical. But then, it must be remembered, the process of time has, likewise, brought with it a portentous fermentation, which, at this moment, is spreading throughout the whole mass of society : all the elements of which appear to be in a state of deep and restless commotion, and to be perpetually tending towards new and untried combinations. Whether these symptoms promise a safe and prosperous result, or, whether they threaten a violent and ruinous explosion, no limited acquaintance with the moral chemistry of our nature can venture, with perfect confidence, to anticipate. Thus much, however, is certain,—that the agitation ought to be watched by men of the profoundest skill, and the most entire self-possession : lest by the withholding of the requisite ingredients, or the infusion of pernicious ones, the mixture should burst into conflagration ; and universal havoc should result from the ignorance, the rashness, or the trepidation of the experimenters.

Such is the state of things to which thoughtful minds must awaken, whenever they alight from their visionary excursions among the generations that have passed away. And in the midst of the "trembling of heart, and the failing of eyes, and the sorrow of mind," which will, at times, come over us, while absorbed in meditations such as these, there is one point to which our hopes and fears are constantly reverting; and that point is no other than the National Church. We learn from history how salutary and conservative a principle this was, in several other awful vicissitudes, through which this our country has passed. And we still fix upon it as the principle, which, if duly estimated, and faithfully applied, will, under God's gracious providence, mainly contribute to her preservation, in the midst of future changes and convulsions.

But can the Church itself be preserved?—the Church, considered as a great National Institution; with all the rightful precedency and honour which, in that character, belong to it. And, when we are considering this tremendous question, it cannot, surely, escape our observation, that there is, at this day, a spirit on the wing, which is ready to combine itself, either with Popery,—or with Dissent, in all its manifold varieties;—with any society, in short, or with any interest, which may be supposed to contain, within itself, the seeds of discontent or disaffection. It is a spirit which is ready to become all things to all men. To the nonconformist, it will become as a nonconformist: to the Romanist, it will become as a Romanist. To the weak, it will become as weak; and will use the accents of candour and of moderation. To the daring, it will show itself full of

hardihood and strength ; and will speak openly of the things which pertain to anarchy and demolition. Its secret object is, to banish all fear of God, and all reverence for the powers that be. But, nevertheless, it can take the form of an angel of light ; and burn, like a seraph, when pointing to the glories of that period, which is to witness the regeneration and the perfection of the human race. It is a spirit, too, which is constantly labouring to enter into the herd, and to possess them : and, if it should be suffered, the end would be, that they must be driven down the steep ; where, at last, they would struggle and perish.

Now, it is the rooted conviction of many sober-minded persons, that there is, also, an antagonist spirit abroad ; able, and more than able, to encounter this minister of evil : in other words, that there pervades the *general* mass of the British community a principle of religion, broad and deep, which will keep it safe from the assaults and the artifices of the tempter. Let us allow this persuasion to be just. Then there arises the consideration—how is the National Church to demean herself, in order that she may contribute the amplest contingent towards the moral preservation of the Empire ? And this question involves another ; how can the Church labour most hopefully for the preservation of her own life and vigour ? How can she best strengthen the things that yet remain unto her ? Is she to concentrate her own powers ; and to occupy her own ground ; and to do her own work ? Or, is she to descend from her own position ; and to learn other tactics than her own ; and to carry on the warfare against Popery, or infidelity, or vice, under the banner of what is called our common Protestantism ?

We would gladly hope, that by far the greater portion of her ministers, and the most intelligent of her laity, will be at no loss for a reply to this question. But, still, there seems to hang a sort of fascination over the spectacle of a holy and catholic league, between christian men of every denomination—all banded together, as brethren, against the hosts of ungodliness,—all prepared for a charitable oblivion of their subordinate differences,—and all resolved to *know nothing but Christ, and Him crucified*. There is no man, whose heart is right with God, but must, occasionally, have felt the difficulty of resistance to the power of this majestic vision. But, nevertheless, when we are brought back to the “sober certainty” of our waking thoughts, the question will intrude itself,—whether this vision ever can be realized, without a virtual surrender of every thing that constitutes the life and essence of a National and Protestant-Catholic Church?—whether the peculiar efficacy of such an establishment must not be lost, from the moment when it consents to number itself merely among the multitude of sects, which form the extended line of the Protestant battle?—and whether the day, on which it abdicates its apostolic post of honor, would not, likewise, be the day, from which might be dated the decay of its influence and power, as the grand conservative element of our social system? We might go still further than this,—and ask, whether the Protestant cause would not, in the end, be fatally weakened and endangered, throughout its whole length and breadth, by such a compromise on the part of the Church of England?

We regret that our space forbids us to work out these thoughts, to their conclusion; because it is

much to be feared that those conclusions are by no means so familiar as might be desired, to many of the most active members of the Church. And, if this fear be just, we would beseech of our brethren to keep in mind, what are the views, and what the persuasions, of those very parties, in whose alliance they are seeking an accession to their strength? Are they aware, or are they not, that the same spirit, which once animated the Puritanical body, and impelled it to the destruction of the hierarchy, has transmigrated, through successive generations, into the ultra-Protestant body of the present day? Are they aware, or are they not, that among the men who are calling loudly for a promiscuous array of the whole Protestant levy, against the thickening force of Popery, there are numbers who stigmatize episcopacy as a remnant of Popish imposture and corruption; and who denounce the clergy of the Establishment, as little better, for the most part, than traitors to the principles of the Reformation? Are they aware, or are they not, that the clamour, which brought Laud to the scaffold, is, even now, vehement and fierce against that very cause, for which Laud counted not his life dear unto him? If they are aware of these things, and yet are impatient for *catholic* coalition and confederacy, nothing is left for us, but to pray that they may be brought to a safer and a better mind. If they are not aware of them, then let them give their days and nights to the study of those annals, which record the temporary predominance of the ultra-protestant principle, in these realms: and let them read, there, the perils of a treaty, offensive and defensive, with it. Let them ponder on the fact, that the parties who, then,

were raving incessantly for the extirpation of Popery, were also the parties who rested not, till they had laid the Church in ruins.

Is it, then, expedient that the Church should at any time be backward in coming to the rescue of the truth, when threatened by the onset of heresy, or superstition? No—not so. But it is expedient nay, it is absolutely needful—that she should fight her own battle, with her own forces, and according, to her own discipline. Let others be left to prosecute the warfare, with the weapons, and the strategy, and the scheme of operation, to which they may be most accustomed; and let every impression made by them upon the ranks of any common foe, be cheered by her, with generous acclamation. But let *her* columns be compact together, with her own men; with men of deliberate “valour and fixed thought;” with men “strong and skilful to their strength.” With this solid mass, let her be prepared to march calmly onward, in legionary power and majesty; and, if need be, into the very heart of her enemy’s camp. But, if she once shall merge herself in a miscellaneous, irregular, tumultuary force, her strength will be dissipated and gone; and her glory will be lost: and it may be well if she is not trampled down beneath the feet of her allies, in the throng and fury of the assault.

In the mean time, we would invoke whatever there is yet among us of constancy, of virtue, and of devotion, to guard the sacred fire which burns upon her altar. We would call on those, who name themselves the friends, the protectors, the children of the Church, as they value the safety and grandeur of their country, to see that the sanctuary be kept from

dishonor ; to labour that our Zion may be *an eternal excellency, and a joy of many generations*. If they would pray, and travail, for the prosperity of Jerusalem, that *peace may be within her walls, and plentifulness within her palaces*, let them remember, that it is mainly *for the sake of the House of the Lord, that they should seek her good* ; that her chiefest glory is, that to her, the nations of the world are looking up, as to the fortress, in which is deposited *the ark of the testimony of Israel* ; and that, if this glory should depart from her, *the abomination which maketh desolate* will probably be nigh at hand.

Under these impressions it is, that the sons and servants of the church,—it is to be hoped,—will return from expatiating over those times, when the altar and the throne went down together. And, feeling that an eminent portion of the Church's strength is derived from the unsullied renown of her fathers, her confessors, and her martyrs, they will look indulgently on this attempt to rescue from foul defacement one venerable name. In the endeavour to discharge this sacred duty, it has not been the purpose of the writer of these pages to conceal the frailties of the man ; but to vindicate him from unmerited contempt and infamy, and to give him his due rank, among the ancient worthies of the realm. And, so long as perfect integrity and sanctity of purpose, with a heart devoted to the service of his God, his sovereign, and his country, can win, for any human being, the reverence of posterity, so long must an illustrious place, among English Prelates, be assigned to Laud.

APPENDIX.

THE following extracts¹ from the collection, entitled *Laud-eana*, (which forms part of the MS. No. 5. in Bishop Cosin's Library at Durham,) are here subjoined, as illustrative of Laud's manner of thinking, and writing. There are no references, in the MS., to the writings of Laud from which the sentences are taken. But the following are, mostly, if not entirely, from his published sermons. His sentiments, on certain subjects of great moment, are pithily, though, perhaps, somewhat quaintly, put forth. But, whatever may be thought of the literary merits of these specimens, it is devoutly to be wished that the spirit, which gave birth to them, may never wholly depart from among us!

“It is fit, very fit, the court, and the great temple of God's service, should be together: That God and the King may be neighbours: That as God is always neer to preserve the King; so the King may be neer, to serve God; and God and the King cannot meet, at Jerusalem, without a solemnity.

When statesmen sit down to consult, they must not forget the Church. And when clergymen kneel down to pray, they must not forget the State: both are but one Jerusalem.

To have peace without plenty, is but a secure possession of misery.

¹ For these extracts, I am indebted to the friendly and courteous attentions of the Rev. Dr. Gilly, Prebendary of Durham.

It is commanded thus (Ps. lxxviii. 32.) Sing unto God, O ye kingdoms of the earth ; there is the exercise of religion : And then it follows, (xxxv.) God will give strength and power unto his people ; there is the blessing.

Doubtless the Spirit of God sees prayer wonderfully necessary for Jerusalem, that He made that, as it were, the door of entrance, both into the seats of judgment among men, and the places of divine worship and adoration of God.

A King in honour and in plenty, and a King that hath added Jerusalem to Hebron, eleven tribes to one, may make it his high honour, *Rogare pacem Jerusalem* ; to pray to God, and persuade with men, for the peace of Christendom.

The same men, which, in respect of one allegiance, make the commonwealth, do, in respect of one faith, make the Church. No building can stand, if the foundation be digged from under it.

The children of the Jewish Church will rise up in judgment against the pillage of Christendom : for the children of that Church left not their mother without walls for defence, nor without palaces for honour.

Some children of the substantial Church have shewed themselves base and unnatural towards the clergy ; and instead of palaces, to think cottages good enough for them. As if it were a part of religion, that Christ and his priests must have less honour in the substance than they had in the ceremony.

Seldom mean they well to princes that against the phrase of the Holy Ghost (Ps. xxi. 6.) i. e. *dedisti eum*, thou hast given him as blessings, will needs be thought blessers of the people. For, such men do but fish, and bait, in troubled waters, to their own advantage.

Hope follows the nature of faith ; and such as the faith is, such is the hope : Both must be *in Domino*, in the Lord ; or neither can be true.

The people cannot hold their places in *gaudio*, in joy, if the King sit not sure in His : and it is an excellent

observacion made by Cassiodore, (a senator he was, and Secretary of State to Theodoricus, and, after, a most strict and devoted Christian,) He makes all sad, that endeavours not the King's joy; *Et, omnes affligit, qui Regi aliquid necessarium subtrahit.*

Though David never took any war in hand, but with God's approbacion, and against his enemies; yet we find 1 Chron. xxii. 8. that his battles and his blood were the cause why God would not suffer him to build his temple. He might sing before the ark, he might serve in the tabernacle, but no temple would God have built by hands of blood. Solomon's hands, hands of peace, might do that.

The Papists keep many of their ffrenzies locked up; and we publish them in print

These two, to love, and to pray for the State and the Church, make one in my text, (viz. Ps. cxxii. 7.) ffior, no man can pray heartily for them, but he that loves them; and no man that truly loves them, can abstain from praying for them, and the peace of them. This is certain: Neither love nor prayer can stand with practising against either; nor with spoil or rapine upon either.

The strength of the King is in the multitude of his people. Prov. xiv. 28. His supply and his defence is there. And the strength of a people is in the honour and renown of their King. His very name is their shield among the nations; and they must make account to bear, if they will be borne.

If you will have God arise, you must arise too. Arise in soul, by devotion; arise in life, by the works of sanctification; and arise in prudence, and in provident care to be up, and not found sleeping in riot and excess, where an enemy is, or ought to be, feared.





283.092
L363l

115948

Le Bas, Charles

283.092
L363l

115948

Le Bas, Charles
The life of Archbishop Laud

